The Communist

20¢ OCTOBER Copy A 1944

A GREAT SUMMER OF COALITION WARFARE

JOSEPH STAROBIN

•

REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN STRATEGY

ADAM LAPIN

•

GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

ALEX BITTELMAN

•

NOTES ON THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE

HANS BERGER

•

THE SOURCE OF COMMUNIST COURAGE

JACQUES DUCLOS

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TEHERAN

Our Path in War and Peace

By EARL BROWDER

"We accepted our review copy as an opportunity to learn at first-hand something about Mr. Browder's own ideas instead of what other people think he thinks. . . . The book has been read from cover to cover—carefully, we believe—and we find ourselves in agreement with every one of his main points. . . . Clear thinking, moderation, true patriotism and vision characterize this small volume that furnishes an excellent foundation for a better understanding of the problems that confront America. It merits wide attention."

Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette

Cloth, $1.50, Paper, $.35

•

THE HERITAGE OF THE COMMUNIST POLITICAL ASSOCIATION

By ROBERT MINOR

A brilliant study of the history of the Communist movement in the United States from its earliest inception up to the present stage of the great worldwide war of liberation. Tracing the development of working class political organizations through several decades, the author draws the rich conclusions for today of the struggles which led to the creation of the Communist Political Association.

Price $.10

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XXIII, No. 10 October, 1944

THE COMMUNIST

A MARXIST MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO ADVANCEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC THOUGHT AND ACTION

EARL BROWDER, Editor EUGENE DENNIS, Associate Editor

V. J. JEROME, Managing Editor

CONTENTS

A Great Summer of Coalition Warfare	*Joseph Starobin*	867
Republican Campaign Strategy	*Adam Lapin*	880
Government Intervention in the National Economy	*Alex Bittelman*	893
Notes on the Dumbarton Oaks Conference	*Hans Berger*	911
The Source of Communist Courage	*Jacques Duclos*	919
The Lesson of the Quebec Election	*Stanley Ryerson*	930
Five Years of War in Europe		934
The Armistice Agreement with Roumania		937
Book Reviews:		
The Tempering of Russia, by Ilya Ehrenburg	*Joseph North*	941
Freedom Road, by Howard Fast	*Doxey Wilkerson*	947
Historic Documents		952

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published Monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. (mail address, P. O. Box 148, Station D), to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Three August Publications

MORALE EDUCATION IN THE AMERICAN ARMY

BY PHILIP FONER

In this new study, a distinguished American historian brings to light a wealth of material, including documents and speeches by Washington, Jackson and Lincoln, letters from soldiers, contemporary newspaper articles and editorials, resolutions and activities of workers' and other patriotic organizations backing up the fighting fronts, all skillfully woven together to make an illuminating analysis of the role of morale in the three great wars of American history—the War of Independence, the War of 1812, and the Civil War.

Price 20¢

MARX AND ENGELS ON REACTIONARY PRUSSIANISM

An important theoretical study which assembles the writings and opinions of Marx and Engels on the historical roots, character and reactionary political and military role of the Prussian Junkers, and illuminates the background of the plans for world domination hatched by the German general staff, the modern industrialists and the criminal Nazi clique.

Price 20¢

WALT WHITMAN—POET OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

BY SAMUEL SILLEN

A new study of the great American poet, together with a discerning selection from his prose and poetic writings which throws light on Whitman's views on the Civil War, democracy, labor, internationalism, culture, etc.

Price $1.50

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A GREAT SUMMER OF COALITION WARFARE

BY JOSEPH STAROBIN

THE epochal summer of 1944 stands out as the period in which the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition advanced decisively toward the achievement of its dual task: complete victory over German imperialism on the battlefield and leadership of the peoples in the reconstruction of a democratic Europe.

Were there doubts as to whether the German armies could be defeated quickly at the periphery of Europe and driven toward their doom on German soil itself? The summer has dispelled these doubts with a power, swiftness, and drama that surpasses the imagination.

Were there uncertainties as to whether the Moscow and Teheran understandings could solve a host of political issues inherited from earlier phases of the war and begin to lay down the foundations of a durable peace? The events of this single summer have removed most of these uncertainties. While new, complex problems unfold themselves, our conviction in regard to the workability and permanence of the Anglo-Soviet-American understanding and world leadership is strengthened.

Four outstanding developments can be registered in summarizing the events of this crowded summer:

Coalition Success in the Wake of the Second Front

1. Despite Hitler's four-year grip on his positions in France, southern Europe and the Baltic-Byelorussian littoral, his armies have not been able to withstand the combined and coordinated offensives from the East, West, and South. Within three months of D-Day, the war has been brought to German soil. The dream of a Europe organized and controlled by Germany has been shattered. The pre-conditions for the destruction of Germany as a great power have been established. Two-front warfare has proved equal to its tasks.

2. Simultaneous with the disintegration of the Axis, the defection of its satellites and the initial phases of their democratization, there has taken place a profound upsurge of united, democratic peoples' movements in the most vital countries of Europe. In Poland, Slovakia, northern Italy, and France the movements of national resistance have overcome internal obstacles, have undertaken open, armed conflict with Germany, completely surpris-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the world with their scope and power, and have entered the political void left by Hitler's bankruptcy to help stabilize the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition and fulfill its aims in Europe. Despite the complexity of the problems now opening out before them, the peoples' movements of national resistance have lived up to the confidence placed in them, and often exceeded every expectation. They now form a force that helps to speed a solution of the inner problems of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition and represent a decisive guarantee that a new Europe emerges from this war.

3. Keeping pace with its military achievements, the coalition has begun to settle post-war economic relations and lay the basis for a world organization, as promised at the Moscow Conference last October. On the political level, the preliminary conference of Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, foreshadows a world organization of all peace-loving states which will have at their disposal the united leadership of the great powers, and the backing of their material and moral force to prevent future aggression. On the economic level, the preliminary oil and aviation conferences, taken together with the Bretton Woods proposals for currency stabilization and an industrialization bank, indicate sound, systematic progress toward economic rehabilitation and world trade expansion. Hitler's "New Order" is bankrupt. It is being ousted from the stage of history with each passing day.

4. In the throes of its doom, however, German fascism does not surrender; it tries to prolong the war as long as possible, tries to organize advance positions for a comeback, and attempts to prevent the complete destruction of its influence and power, not only in Germany, but wherever the program of the United Nations is not quickly and relentlessly put into life. Hitler's execution of dissident generals is the most dramatic example of the tenacity with which Hitlerism attempts to delay its defeat. The tenacity of fascist circles in Italy, the delay in Finland's final break with its German masters, the maneuvers of fascist Spain, the defiance of hemisphere solidarity by Argentina, are all phases of this same tendency. The sabotage of the national resistance movement by former aides of fascism and various reactionary Social-Democratic elements, plus the revived anti-Soviet incitement in William C. Bullitt's wishful prediction of a western European war against the Soviet Union within fifteen years, are likewise aspects of this same tenacity of fascism. The Republican Party's bid for power in our November elections is also related to this manifestation. In so far as the G.O.P., and especially its Hoover-McCormick wing, wants to limit the eradication of Hitlerism in Europe and circumscribe the work of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, it reveals how much it has in common with the doomed forces of Europe. It reflects the stubborn resistance to the United Nations which must be expected everywhere. The main forces of Hitlerism do not sur-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

render, except in isolated circumstances: they fight back, openly or covertly. They can only be removed from the path of history by the unity of the democratic forces and the relentless fulfillment of the Teheran program.

The Allied Campaign in the West

There was a point in the Anglo-American campaign in France where our armies were apparently stalled in the narrow bridgehead between Caen and St. Lo. Fears were expressed, particularly in the British press, about a repetition of the Anzio experience. German boasts of the impregnability of the Atlantic coast-line seemed to be confirmed; likewise the fears of enormous casualties, deliberately exploited by the defeatist press in our country. The limited contribution of the French resistance movement in Normandy seemed also to bear out predictions, such as those from Hanson Baldwin,* that the people's movements of Europe could not be rated a factor in its liberation.

But when the Allies broke out of Normandy and inflicted the heavy defeat on the Germans on Avranches and Falaise, and the lists of German casualties and prisoners mounted rapidly, there was a tendency in some quarters to jump to opposite and equally premature conclusions. Some circles* began to speculate that the German High Command was actually inviting the Allies into France, and perhaps into Germany. Such a premise inevitably implied some kind of prearranged plan, which in turn threw into doubt the integrity of the Anglo-American-Soviet understanding.

We may well pause on this question in discussing the military developments of the summer because it is crucial to our entire perspective—not only our estimate of the past, but our attitude toward the immediate future. The rapid German collapse in the West can be more simply and more accurately explained. While there is no doubt that the ruling circles of Germany are split wide open, and many important groups would prefer to capitulate to the Anglo-American armies, and while there is no doubt that the Nazis employ suppositions of this kind in their persistent effort to split the United Nations, *the characteristic feature of this period is the resistance of the Nazis, their tenacious attempt to hold on on both fronts, their tenacious effort to prolong the war, and in fact to turn all of Germany into a theatre*

* Hanson Baldwin, in *Foreign Affairs* for July 1944, appraising the problems of the coming invasion of Europe, characteristically underestimates the popular forces, an underestimation apparently shared by high American military authorities: *"The resistance forces inside the Continent must not be counted upon too heavily; Hitler has suppressed them ruthlessly, and the police forces of Europe are filled with collaborationists."* (My emphasis—J.S.) Wishful thinking? or just bad guessing!

* Maj. George Fielding Eliot, in the *New York Herald Tribune* for Aug. 23, speculates that *"there is every prospect that the Anglo-Americans will be on the Rhine before the Russians reach the Oder—by German choice."* (My emphasis—J.S.) It should be added that Eliot changes his mind frequently in subsequent columns and decides that the Nazis will make a last-ditch resistance in the west as in the east.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Nazi guerrilla warfare against all the United Nations.

The course of the German war effort in France can best be explained by the following factors:

a) The Nazis *did* resist as fiercely as they could with forces available, but after Allied power became overwhelming, they had no reserves to throw into battle. And this was because, as we had been claiming for two years, their land armies are tied up on the Soviet front. The Fortress Europe was a shell. When sufficient power to break that shell was unleashed from the West, the shell cracked. *The German withdrawals in France were not voluntary, as part of a political calculation; they were involuntary, forced upon the Germans, and were made in order to salvage what could be salvaged in order to wage as determined a struggle as possible in northern Holland, the west bank of the Rhine and Germany proper.*

b) The phenomenal uprising of the French people cannot be ignored in explaining the rapid collapse of the Atlantic Wall. The fact is that in many places, the French Forces of the Interior engaged larger units of the German army than the Allies themselves. In the Grenoble area, at the second largest French city, Marseilles, and the third largest city, Bordeaux, as well as in the *massif centrale*, the Germans were ousted substantially by the French themselves. Thousands of German troops were involved in these operations. The liberation of Paris by the citizens of Paris of course speaks for itself. The figures for prisoners taken by isolated units of the F.F.I. shows that the war maps by themselves do not give the full picture of what happened. *The advance of the Allies is deceptive unless it is realized that the war became general throughout France, and the position of the Germans untenable everywhere.*

c) The debacle in France took place at the height of the most ferocious fighting in eastern Europe, especially the major Soviet threat to the German position at Warsaw and just north of Warsaw. Not only had the Red Army advanced continuously from the Vitebsk-Minsk-Orsha region late in June until late in July, but the first weeks of August saw the bloodiest battles in the Warsaw direction as well as the encirclement and destruction of a third of a million Nazis at Iasi. *This means that the Nazis could not withdraw any forces from the East at precisely the moment when their Normandy resistance was overwhelmed, and helps explain the rapidity of the German defeat in the West.*

Finally, as a conclusive argument against the idea that the German withdrawal had political objectives which imply prior understanding with the western powers, it should be noted that the European Advisory Commission, in which the Big Three are represented, has evidently concluded its outline for the occupation and military administration of the Reich.

Even if we assume that the long-range policy toward Germany may yet be the subject of differences within the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition (differences which can be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resolved only by practical experience), the short-range plans on the demarcation of Soviet, British and American zones of occupation, and the general outlines of the military adminstration, are completed. We have the President's statement to this effect in August, 1944.

The Emergence of a New, Democratic Europe

In estimating the new factor in the European picture, the success of the peoples' resistance movements, it is worth noting a number of important political-diplomatic developments, in some of the outstanding European countries.

In Yugoslavia, the government-in-exile, headed by the new premier, Ivan Subasich, was reconciled with the National Liberation movement, headed by Marshal Tito, after the conference in Italy on June 13-17. In August, Subasich declared that Tito's forces were recognized as the "highest expression of national resistance." The principle of a federal Yugoslavia based on the national equality of the Serb, Croat, and Slovene nations was acknowledged. The traitor general, Draza Mikhailovich, was officially deposed from his post as minister of war in the emigré government, and most of the reactionary Serb influences in the foreign service of the Yugoslav government have been eliminated. That solution is a testimony to the vigor of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition.

In Greece, the exiled government under the new premier, George Papandreou, has been finally compelled to unite with the Greek Liberation movement, the powerful E.A.M. E.A.M. representatives, among them Greek Communists, are now members of the exiled cabinet in Italy. While the heritage of bitterness is greater in the case of Greece than Yugoslavia, the fact is that the remaining problems of the Greek liberation movement, the clarification of the government's policy toward the Greek traitors and toward national unity in the post-war period, have now been transferred within the framework of a united government. There they will be most rapidly solved, especially as the exiled government is influenced by the full force of popular will inside of Greece itself.

With the participation of the Soviet Union, changes took place in Italy, also. The liberation of Rome, just a week before the second front opened, made it possible for the King to step out of the picture, for Marshal Badoglio to resign, and a new government, under Ivanoe Bonomi, to be formed. Rome itself, and everything south of it, is now within the jurisdiction of the Italian government. In August, the historic Pact of Unity between the Socialist and Communist Parties took place, and the Italian Confederation of Labor was united under a joint Communist, Socialist and Christian Democrat leadership.

These developments, taken together with the upsurge of the partisan movement in northern Italy, and its improved relation both with the Bonomi government and the Allied Mediterranean Command, are of outstanding importance.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is true that Italy's ambiguous status—neither an enemy nor an ally—still delays her rapid rehabilitation and internal progress. But the failure of the A.M.G. to solve these problems, resulting in a profound moral and material crisis, is now so generally acknowledged, especially by American commentators, that a rapid change is inevitable. By contrast with the earlier Badoglio period, the Italian democratic forces have grown in strength and prestige: their assumption of legitimate power in Italy cannot long be dalayed.

Poland remains the one instance in which the coalition has not yet succeeded in resolving the differences between the peoples' liberation movement inside the country and the most representative figures of the emigré government. Or more exactly, Great Britain and the United States have not yet drawn the full conclusions from the authentic rise of the new Poland and the obvious bankruptcy of the reactionary emigré clique in London. As a result, the Polish question remains the focus for anti-Soviet intrigue, which now reveals itself more clearly also as intrigue against the interests of Great Britain and the United States; the longer it is permitted to continue the more dangerous it will be for our own national interest and understanding.

The most decisive fact of the past summer was the emergence on liberated Polish soil of the Polish Committee of National Liberation, which is unifying all fighters for a democratic, independent Poland, is gaining greater prestige among all decent, democratic Polish circles, and is now administering liberated Polish territory by agreement with the Soviet Union. The emigré leaders, notably the group around Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, had their opportunity early in August to unite with the Commitee of Liberation on the basis of the March, 1921, Constitution and a foreign policy friendly to the Soviet Union. The failure of the so-called Polish moderates to do so, has only demonstrated the powerful hold of Polish reaction on the emigré regime, and serves to discredit it completely. By contrast, the Liberation Committee is carrying through essential agrarian reforms, is reviving industry, and is attracting international attention as the builder of the kind of Poland which will prevent eastern Europe from ever again being the focal point of European instability and world wars.

Another extremely promising development in eastern Europe was the collapse of the Axis alliances with Finland, Rumania, and Bulgaria, opening the way for the participation of these countries in defeating Germany and making possible the democratization of their own internal life. This trend is still least defined in Finland. It is clearest in the case of Rumania, whose National Democratic Front has come to power and is contributing directly to the defeat of Germany and Hungary. In Bulgaria's case, the new government represents a basic break with the pro-German cliques of the past two generations, and opens the way to fundamental dem-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ocratic changes in that country. All in all, the trend is toward the final elimination of pro-German influences in eastern Europe. In all three cases, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States have acted in substantial harmony. The collapse of the *Drang noch Osten* is a tribute to the power of the coalition.

Finally, and most important, France has provided a decisive instance of a people's liberation moving forward to shape its own destinies. Early in July, after General de Gaulle's visit to Washington, the attitude of all the great powers toward France was brought into substantial alignment. An A.M.G. for France was avoided. *De facto* recognition of the resistance movement was achieved, and the last possibility of a Darlan-type of development in American policy toward France was eliminated.

At the same time, the leadership of the French liberation movement itself was stabilized with the entrance of two Communist leaders into the government. This process has been accelerated with the national uprising in August, which revealed the Council of National Resistance to have been the major force in guiding the destruction of German power. The center of gravity in French politics has shifted to its staunchest, most reliable and progressive elements, in which of course the great Communist Party of France plays an honorable and potent role. The national uprising has guaranteed the emergence of a new French army. The purge of Vichy men and influence from French life has been accelerated. A rapid advance to basic democratic reforms both in industry and politics is now on the order of the day.

France is the most complicated country of western Europe, socially most advanced and to a certain extent the test case for the entire coalition. While the tremendous peoples' uprising is the historical guarantee that fascism, both German and French, will be dismantled, it should be clear that grave problems still remain.

The urgency of immediate local elections and rapid national elections for a new Constituent Assembly has been stressed by the Communist Party. The invigoration of the French army by the incorporation of the resistance forces, the F.F.I., is still proceeding all too slowly, and often faces sabotage from former Vichy officers. And swift justice to the collaborators, now that most of them have been arrested, is a pressing issue. The reconstruction of the French labor movement and more adequate representation for the resistance groups, as well as the patriotic political parties, notably the Communists, still remains to be fulfilled. Solution of these problems is often delayed by the cross-purposes of American and British policy, and the unprincipled maneuvers of various Social Democrats and former Vichy adherents, whom the swift change of eevnts has disorientated but not completely destroyed. Certainly, in the case of France, it is the able leadership and prestige of the French working class which is the guarantee of swift progress to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the complete eradication of fascism, and the stabilization of coalition relations throughout all of western Europe.

All of these developments have certain important features in common. They have all proceeeded under the banner of Anglo-Soviet-American unity, which is clearly the hope and unifying force of all the peoples of Europe. In all cases, the working classes have proved the most reliable defenders of each European nation, and the working-class parties are in the forefront of the resistance movements. In all cases, the key to stabilizing the resistance movements lies in the speed with which the Germans are cleared out, the collaborators of the Germans removed from political life, and the elementary democratic reforms achieved in industry and agriculture. These reforms are often easier to achieve in the predominantly agricultural countries, where feudalism was intimately tied to German imperialism and suffers a common fate with German imperialism. In a country like France, these problems take on different shape.

It is true that many issues remain inside of the liberation movements, but we should guard against the oversimplified and often provocative interpretations which some sections of the American press place on these inner problems.

The Communist Parties of France or Italy, for example, have not set themselves up in opposition to the bourgeois groupings of the liberation movement, as some correspondents persist in reporting. On the contrary, these parties are fighting for a most rapid fulfillment of the program which all resistance forces have in common.

The new lines of division are not between the working class and the bourgeoisie in these countries; the line of division is between the national unity of the liberation movement, effectively carrying out its tasks and program, and the transformed centers of the pro-German and former fascist elements who attempt to stabilize themselves and attempt to sabotage the United Nations platform in each country. Often, as in Italy, they are assisted by reactionary elements of the Social-Democrats and individual careerist agents of Munichite forces in our own country and Britain.

The G.O.P.'s Attempt to Disband the Coalition

On September 1, the beginning of the war's sixth year, the Soviet government newspaper, *Izvestia,* issued a significant warning against any "under-estimation of the difficulties" in eradicating German fascism and building a genuine peace. The warning received too little attention in our own country, although it coincided with two aspects of the general counter-offensive of fascism in the past few months: the William C. Bullitt article in *Life,* and the increasingly disruptive activities of the Republican Party's chief spokesmen, especially as regards a world security organization and international economic relations.

Izvestia declared that *"a picture*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is clearly unfolding before the grand Anglo-Soviet-American coalition of great and difficult tasks connected not only with final victory, but also with cementing victory and securing a durable and firm peace." (My emphasis—J.S.)

It will be noted that *Izvestia* contrasts the greatness of the tasks with the difficulties in achieving them. It is characteristic also that *Izvestia* distinguishes between *final* military victory and the *cementing* of that victory. For it is plain that however great the progress of the coalition in the past summer, some of its major difficulties lie just ahead. The enemy counter-offensive, while it will not stop the coalition on the field of battle, can nevertheless delay the cementing of the hard-won military victory; in other words, the enemy is concentrating his energies on the problems that lie between the war and the durable, firm peace. These are also the problems that underlie the two conferences at Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods.

There are many aspects to this counter-offensive, and each of them could be discussed at great length. For example, William C. Bullitt's article in *Life*, which synthesizes all the broadcasts of the German radio with the bombastic pretensions of both the Norman Thomas and the *New Leader* Social-Democrats, is in reality far more than an attempt to split the United Nations at this late date. It is a program to nullify the entire achievement of the peoples' liberation movements in Europe, to confuse Americans on the emerging new, democratic forms of life in Europe, to begin a 15-year guerrilla warfare in Europe and America in preparation for a third World War within fifteen years.

Bullitt is not merely trying to *undermine* the Moscow and Teheran understandings between the socialist and capitalist sectors of the coalition; *he comes out openly against that understanding, and proposes to substitute open conflict in the shortest space of time.* This is not simply of assistance to Hitler today, for Hitler is probably too close to defeat to make use of it. It is an open advertisement for another Hitler and another Munich. It is therefore the crude expression of a strategy which is indicated more subtly and indirectly by some of the leading spokesmen for the Republican Party in the present election campaign.

Consider the G.O.P.'s attack on two outstanding developments within the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition in recent months: the Dumbarton Oaks meeting, on the political level, and the Bretton Woods conference on the economic level.

The Dumbarton Oaks meeting, and those which will follow it, concern the implementation of a decision reached at Moscow a year ago. It sets itself the job of building an international security organization, a physical expression of the extension of the coalition into the post-war world.

It is clear now that the proposals of all four governments, China, the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union, are quite similar.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They all acknowledge the shortcomings of the old League of Nations. Despite differences of detail and method which are still unresolved at this writing, all plans begin from the cardinal premise that the Big Four shall remain united. They all provide for a World Council, which shall be empowered to use force against aggression. They all agree that while the sovereignty of nations, large and small, must be respected, the small nations shall not be employed as pawns by any of the big powers to evade carrying out the united will of the council when faced by aggression.

And all plans also start out from the premise that such an organization shall be built now, even before the military victory. In fact, it is plain that in the minds of the Dumbarton Oaks conferees, the terms of the armistice with Germany and Japan will be carried out fully *only* if simultaneously a world organization assumes responsibility for curbing the aggressor and guaranteeing world security.

How, then, have the Republican leaders reacted to these plans? To begin with, senators like Robert La Follette announced as far back as June that they opposed building a world organization until they knew just what the peace would be like. Behind this pretended concern for a righteous peace lay the old effort to drive the country into isolationism.

On August 16, on the eve of the conference and without bothering to consult the Administration, Thomas E. Dewey blasted the impending deliberations on the grounds that a "four-power alliance" would result, leading to a "four-power dictatorship" over the small nations. Although leading Republican senators are members of a bi-partisan committee with whom Secretary of State Cordell Hull has consulted since the winter, Dewey declared that his attack on Dumbarton Oaks was the position of the Republican Party.

Not only did he misrepresent the aims of the conference before the nation and the world, but he was obviously attacking national unity in connection with foreign policy. Dewey's subsequent effort to associate himself with national unity, by inviting his foreign policy adviser, John Foster Dulles, to confer with Mr. Hull, only made his true purpose more obvious. For it appears that Dulles—as reflected in Dewey's speeches—wants to separate the policing of a defeated Germany from the building of a world organization. He made this distinction in August and amplified it in his Louisville speech on September 8.

In this disinction the strategy of the Republicans can be seen most clearly. On the one hand, they wish to appear before the world as committed to a thorough victory over Germany and Japan; they thump their chests about how irrevocably they wish to see the enemy crushed and policed by a four-power military alliance.

But they gave themselves away by making the organization of world security a separate matter, to be dealt with in the indefinite future (without such frenzied haste, in Senator La Follette's phrase), an

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organization in which force will not be available to the great powers and in which favorite small nations will have a veto power as in the old League of Nations. *For it is plain that they mean to disband the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition as quickly as possible.* In his Louisville speech, Dewey even foresaw the possibility that there might be other aggressors in the future, other than Germany and Japan, an unmistakable reference to the Soviet Union.

If we recall John Foster Dulles' book, *War, Peace, and Change,* and Herbert Hoover's book, *Problems of a Lasting Peace,* we can better understand the Republican aim.

Dulles is enamored of Article 19 in the League of Nations Covenant, the article which provided for "peaceful change," a favorite article of Hitler's in the years of "appeasement" and a cover-up for Hitler's early aggressions in Europe and his demand for colonies. Herbert Hoover* suggested as early as 1942 that everything in the world is in flux, and observed that war-time combinations often change; former enemies become friends while friends become enemies.

A final Republican strategem in connection with Dumbarton Oaks involves the issue of whether American force to prevent aggression will be implemented by the American delegate on the World Council without having to come back to Congress for authorization. Walter Lippman was greatly worried on the G.O.P. stand, and in a column on September 14, in the New York *Herald-Tribune,* informs us that he wrote to Senator Arthur Vandenberg for a precise opinion.

Vandenberg replied that if it were just a matter of carrying out the armistice he would not oppose such power in the hands of the executive. But if it were a matter of power in the hands of a true world organization, he would fight the proposal in the Senate, and mobilize the G.O.P. against it. In fact, Vandenberg voted against the proposal in Cordell Hull's bi-partisan committee.

Here again, the G.O.P.'s strategy is clear, and *Izvestia's* warning is given point. If President Roosevelt is re-elected, Vandenberg means to sabotage the policing of Germany and Japan as far as possible, and meanwhile block American leadership in a world organization. If Dewey is elected, Vandenberg is ready to leave the armistice and the policing in Dewey's safe hands, while accomplishing his prime purpose as far as the world organization goes: that is, limiting the coalition, dissolving it as quickly as possible, and preventing it from giving world leadership in the future.

From this condensed analysis, it

---

* On page 2 of Herbert Hoover's *Problems of a Lasting Peace,* he expresses doubts as to whether the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition will outlast the war, and speculates on the "kaleidoscopic shifts in the relations of nations" even during the war, characteristic wishful thinking.

John Foster Dulles, in his book *War, Peace and Change* (Harper & Brothers, 1939), says on page 48: *"Far from being sacred, it would be iniquitous, even if it were practicable, to put shackles on the dynamic peoples and condemn them forever to acceptance of conditions which might become intolerable."* (My emphasis—J.S.)

To Dulles, the League of Nations failed, not because it did not curb the aggressors, but because it did not satisfy them in advance.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is plain how much the future of the coalition and the realization of Teheran are bound up with the re-election of the President and a progressive Congress to fulfill the will of the people.

Equally illuminating is the Republican criticism of the Bretton Woods plan, and here Sen. Robert A. Taft's objections have now been confirmed by Winthrop Aldrich, president of the Chase National Bank.

The Bretton Woods proposals called for international currency stabilization and a world investment bank. In effect, this means two banks, one for short-term loans and the other for long-term loans. Their essential feature is that all the leading nations are involved in a central organization to which they contribute funds and which they can draw upon for funds. The Big Four provide the leadership of these two organizations; through them, the United States is in a position to realize for its own benefit and for the benefit of the rest of the world the tremendous economic power which it has achieved in the war.

But it is crucial in understanding both proposals that the smaller nations will not be at the mercy of one or two large creditors. If their currencies are temporarily deranged, they can draw on the funds contributed by *all* the nations; and if they need funds for investment, they can draw on the funds of all nations instead of being at the mercy of a single great power. Bretton Woods, in other words, is a plan that preserves the sovereignty of the small nations from pressure by the large ones. It does not press the debtor to mortgage his sovereignty or place his internal mode of life at the veto power of the creditor. It is therefore an essential complement to the whole spirit of Teheran.

But what do the Republicans, the vaunted defenders of the small nations, have to say? Sen. Robert Taft as early as July 10, at the very beginning of the Conference, declared flatly that Congress would not approve the Treasury's plan. He complained that the United States would not have full control over its own funds, and that it would face the possible veto of other powers. But this was just a mask to cover his real aim. He proposed that the United States "reach some agreement with the British regarding the relation of the dollar and the pound and then take up the other countries, one by one, and attempt to assist them by direct credits." Rep. Charles Dewey of Illinois subsequently introduced a resolution in the House to raise the Export-Import Bank's loan powers, in line with Taft's idea.

The game is quite obvious. Taft proposes to drive the hardest possible bargain with Great Britain, beat down and destroy this powerful capitalist competitor by a bilateral agreement. He then proposes to call in the other nations, "one by one," and offer them "direct" credits, in return for which, of course, Taft will demand those political concessions which made the name of the United States so hated throughout Latin America in the last 50 years.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Winthrop Aldrich's proposal on September 15 is a direct descendant of the Taft and Dewey scheme, and is distinguished only by the peremptory tone of this Republican banker-imperialist: "I suggest that the plans advanced by the Bretton Woods conference should not be adopted by the United States. I propose instead that the United States, the United Kingdom and other members of the British Commonwealth of Nations should enter into immediate conversations on such problems as tariff barriers, imperial preference, export subsidies, bulk purchasing and regional currency agreements."

If these conversations are successful, Aldrich would then make a dollar-pound currency pact, and even grant Britain a substantial loan for this purpose. After that, "attention can and should be directed immediately to the problem of stabilizing other currencies," and finally, where debtor nations cannot borrow in the private market (that is from the Chase National Bank) Aldrich proposes "that the Export-Import Bank be given increased borrowing powers so that it will be in a position to grant long-term stabilization loans of a meritorious character." And the same "meritorious" nations would be granted reconstruction and industrialization loans where they cannot be obtained privately.

What we have here is a companion piece to the G.O.P.'s attack on the Dumbarton Oaks meeting, namely, a proposal to prevent a truly United Nations approach to the problems of currency, trade and industrialization. *The tight-fisted, hardjawed Republican banker wants to impose his will upon Britain, and then turn about and impose upon all the ruined nations of Europe the unilateral hegemony of American imperialism.*

Such an approach is the direct opposite of the settlement of Anglo-American economic relations within the Teheran framework. It is once again the "Big Stick" in economic affairs. Its perspective is not expansion of world trade but the limitation of world economic relations to the dictates of American imperialists, who shall be the sole judges of which debtors are meritorious and which are not. It is the antithesis of Bretton Woods. It would limit the possibilities of American trade and investment expansion while harmfully prolonging the reconstruction of a devastated Europe and Asia.

These are some of the difficulties before the coalition, difficulties directly inspired by the Republican Party, and representing the effort of reactionary American forces to salvage from the military defeat of Germany some basis for the maintenance of fascist influence in Europe and Asia.

It is against them, as well as the crude appeasers and German agents, that Americans must vote in November. On the outcome of this vote depends to a larger extent than many realize the future of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN STRATEGY

BY ADAM LAPIN

IN his speech on May 20, to the national convention which formed the Communist Political Association, Earl Browder said that we might as well face the fact that the necessity for conducting a national election this year placed a "dangerous strain on the national unity required for victory." Browder urged a moratorium at this critical time on the partisan "recklessness, abandon and irresponsibility" which all too frequently characterize American political campaigns.

President Roosevelt made it clear in his acceptance speech to the Democratic Party convention that he could not campaign in the usual manner. Mr. Roosevelt has continued to devote himself to his duties as President and Commander-in-Chief, mapping the strategy of final victory and the shape of a lasting peace based on international cooperation. Senator Truman, the vice-presidential candidate who has necessarily had to carry much of the burden of the campaign, has kept his speeches on a high level, discussing the need to plan for jobs after the war and for international cooperation. He has warned against the isolationists still active in our midst and against interjecting partisan politics in the discussion of peace plans.

The campaign has already imposed the strains on our national unity of which Browder spoke. If the damage has not been still greater, this is altogether due to the character of the campaign being conducted by the President and his running mate. It is a simple fact that no campaign since 1864 has been marked by such irresponsibility and lack of regard for the national interest as the current campaign of the G.O.P. to gain power. Indeed, one of the principal campaign arguments of the Republicans amounts to the contention that Roosevelt should abdicate his responsibilities as Commander-in-Chief during the course of the campaign. The logic of the G.O.P. position is that the moratorium should not be on partisan politics but on the conduct of the war.

When the President conferred with the commanders in the Pacific area on the strategy of the war against Japan, there was an immediate outburst of protest from the Republicans. Rep. Everett Dirksen of Illinois declared in a speech prepared by the Republican National Committee that the President had used the Navy for political pur-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poses. Rep. Harold Knutson, one of the leading House Republicans, charged in apparent seriousness that a battleship had to be diverted to take the President's dog from the Aleutians to Seattle. Dewey himself characterized the President's trip as a "vacation." After the President had reported to the nation on his trip, the Republicans promptly demanded that they be given equal time in broadcasts to the servicemen to reply to what they considered a political speech. This approach was suggested to them by the Socialist Party, which insisted that Norman Thomas, the negotiated peace advocate who is its candidate for President, be permitted to reply to the President.

It was generally known for several days in advance that the Quebec conference between the President and Churchill was in the offing. And when a newspaperman asked Dewey, who was then starting on his campaign tour, to comment on the timing, the G.O.P. candidate replied that it was an "amazing coincidence." The G.O.P. standard bearer actually suggested that the only reason for the Quebec meeting was to offset his tour to the West Coast. It could consistently be argued on the same basis that the President should order his generals in the field to refrain from winning spectacular victories until after the elections. Dewey advances the argument that the President's official position gives him an advantage, and he virtually proposes that Mr. Roosevelt cancel the advantage by deserting his post in time of war.

Dewey has not hesitated to repeat the slur of the America Firsters that the war in the Far East has been sabotaged by the President because he feared General Douglas MacArthur politically. Not only is this a treacherous effort to undermine confidence in the nation's war leadership, but it is an implicit attack on the basic war strategy worked out by the United Nations, which is to crush Hitler first. And the world can see today that this strategy has been correct.

The G.O.P. Presidential candidate and those who speak on his behalf have attempted to counteract popular confidence in President Roosevelt because of his war leadership by taking the line that the war is practically over and the next President will be a peace president. To put this across, they have been telling the country that the defeat of Japan will be a quick and easy job. House Minority Leader Joseph W. Martin put it this way in a Washington interview recently:

"It is obvious that the war in Europe can't last much longer. It is also apparent that the people already have discounted the ultimate defeat of Japan."

Any idea that the defeat of Japan can be "discounted" as rapid and easy is extremely dangerous. It tends to spread complacency, to cause relaxation of the war effort, and to give rise to increased pressure for a premature ending of wartime controls. The consequences of such an attitude would be prolongation of the war and increased

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cost in American lives. That, however, appears to count for little with the G.O.P.

The strategy of the G.O.P. high command can be properly understood only if the essential fact is grasped that it places the war in a secondary position, that it puts partisan considerations first. Dewey's entire campaign must be viewed against this background. It is this approach which underlies the irresponsibility and recklessness of the G.O.P. campaign, and particularly the shifting and inconsistent character of Dewey's foreign policy statements.

Dewey's foreign policy was shaped for him well in advance of the G.O.P. convention by men like Herbert Hoover and Robert Taft, who have never supported the war and who have consistently rejected international cooperation. But Dewey must of necessity in his speeches also appeal to the overwhelming mass of Republican and independent voters who sincerely desire effective action by the United Nations to prevent another war. This does not mean, of course, that Dewey has no foreign policy. A contradictory and uncertain policy is also a policy. And in the zigzags and twists of his statements the real emphasis is on opposition to the Teheran accord, to the basic tenets of the Administration's program of America's international cooperation in co-leadership with the Soviet Union and Britain to ensure enduring peace and promote economic world security.

The *Chicago Tribune* has not been overly disturbed by Dewey's occasional lapses from its editorial line. In his Louisville speech, Dewey went to some pains to assure the nation that he supports the moves for an international security organization to maintain peace. He even said that he backed the plan for an assembly including the small nations and a "council small enough for almost continuous meeting and prompt action." Indeed, he even claimed the credit for making "a practical beginning with Secretary Hull in bipartisan cooperation to establish an international organization for peace and security."

But the record of Dewey's position on the Dumbarton Oaks conference reveals the essential duplicity and irresponsibility which characterize his stand on all public issues. Dewey's "practical beginning" in cooperation was, of course, his demagogic blast at the conference as an effort by the Big Four to destroy the independence of small nations. Dewey declared that "there appears to be a cynical intention that the four great Allied powers shal continue for all time to dominate the world by force and through individual agreements as to spheres of influence."

This was in line with the attacks on the conference by the Hearst and McCormick-Patterson papers, and it was also an effort to win support from anti-Soviet Polish organizations and similar minority groups. But the Dewey blast did not meet with a very favorable response. In a sharp rebuff to Dewey, Wendell Willkie informed the G.O.P. candidate that if he

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had taken the trouble to check the facts he would have discovered that there was no truth to the reports that the Dumbarton Oaks conference was a threat to the small nations. Secretary Hull promptly invited Dewey to meet with him to get a more accurate picture of the conference, and Dewey dispatched as his emissary John Foster Dulles, who is slated to be Secretary of State in the event of a G.O.P. victory and who as late as March, 1939, said that there was no danger to this country from Nazi aggression.

Dewey was inevitably forced to retreat from his initial statement. The fact that he was compelled to endorse publicly the general objectives of the Dumbarton Oaks conference was a victory for Secretary Hull's single-minded devotion to the cause of fostering international cooperation. And it was a concession to the tremendous mass sentiment for all necessary steps to prevent war.

But this does not mean that Dewey can therefore be relied on to give expression to the aspirations of the people for lasting peace. In the very same Louisville speech, Dewey spoke against "an American W.P.A. for all the rest of the world." This is a familiar *Chicago Tribune* epithet, and it stands for opposition to economic cooperation between the United States and the other United Nations through monetary stabilization, a world bank and like measures and instrumentalities. In one speech, Dewey said that he was for an international security organization—and that he was against the economic steps necessary to provide a firm basis for peace and security. Naturally, the *Chicago Tribune* and the *New York Herald Tribune*, the extreme poles of Dewey's newspaper support, chose to emphasize different aspects of this same speech.

Dewey said that he was for cooperation to maintain peace—but in his Philadelphia speech the day before he had taken a position which jeopardized the complete destruction of Nazi Germany by the armed forces of the United Nations. Dewey accused the Administration of plans to delay demobilization of our troops and said that our "armed forces should be transported home and released at the earliest practical moment after victory." A statement of this sort can be interpreted only as opposition to the plans of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union for guaranteeing the final defeat of Germany, if necessary by the policing of occupied territory for some time to come. Furthermore, statements of this sort are injurious to the morale of the armed forces.

The G.O.P. candidate has found it necessary to learn how to talk glibly about the mechanics of international organization, internationalization of the Ruhr and an international commission to supervize the disarmament of Germany. But Dewey and the principal G.O.P. policy makers stand opposed to the very foundation of permanent peace. The true measuring rod of all Dewey's statements is where he stands on cooperation among the Big Four. Without genuine

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

understanding and collaboration between the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and China, any international peace organization will be built on sand. Dewey has never shown that he accepts this fact.

Last year Dewey proposed an exclusive military alliance between Great Britain and the United States. Only a few months ago he was still drawing fine lines between Great Britain and the Soviet Union in terms of the relationship which each would be permitted to enjoy with this country. It was no accident that he denounced the Dumbarton Oaks conference, falsely charging that it plans a dictatorship of the Big Four. Dewey may now prefer to forget this statement, but it was a logical outgrowth of his unwillingness to envision a close working relationship among the Big Four which would be the foundation of world peace. It was an inevitable development of his repeated jibes at the Teheran conference.

Dewey's Domestic Policy

If there is in Dewey's campaign speeches no real expression of confidence that the Big Four can build a durable peace, there is similarly in his domestic policy no confidence that the United States can enjoy full employment and full production after the war. This follows as a consequence of G.O.P. rejection of a vastly expanded foreign trade underscored in the emphasis given by the Republican platform to high tariffs and trade barriers.

It is true that Dewey urges a "rebirth of faith in our future," that he says we have "not even begun to build our industrial plant." Indeed, he tries to make it appear that the G.O.P. is the party of jobs while the Roosevelt Administration was responsible for the depression!

Here he adopts Herbert Hoover's thesis that the economic crisis of the 1930's was about to end in 1932, but Roosevelt came along and prolonged it! He thus blames unemployment on the President in order to cover up Hoover's shameful do-nothing starvation program.

Of course, to do this, he must ignore the vast public work and relief programs initiated by Roosevelt to alleviate the sufferings of the people, the social security measures, the housing and farm rehabilitation measures, the Federal deposit and home owners relief programs, and numerous other measures which reduced unemployment from 16,000,000 to 7,000,000 and improved the general economic and health standards of the people.

But campaign oratory cannot substitute for the bed-rock realities of G.O.P. policy. Even conservative newspaper columnists such as David Lawrence comment on the complete absence in Dewey's Philadelphia speech of anything approaching a domestic program.

Dewey's lack of program is not accidental. It is the essence of Dewey's position that there should be no program. As he put it in his Philadelphia speech: "We cannot have jobs and opportunity if we surrender our freedom to government control. We do not need to surrender our freedom to govern-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment control in order to have the economic security to which we are entitled as free men." The G.O.P. crusade against government controls, emphasized most heavily in Bricker's speeches, means during the war period itself a thinly veiled opposition to war-time economic and industrial mobilization. During the reconversion period, it means opposition to the elementary steps which must be taken by industry, labor and government in cooperation to assure full employment and the swiftest transition to peace-time production.

This was seen most clearly during the reconversion debate in Congress. Practically all the Republicans in the Senate lined up with the most reactionary poll-tax Democrats in opposition to the Murray-Kilgore Bill which provided an overall reconversion program and supported the less adequate George Bill. In the House, Republicans teamed up with the die-hard poll taxers to take the heart out of the George Bill. Most of the debate centered around Federal payments to supplement state unemployment compensation systems, which, the Republicans argued, would be a violation of states' rights. But there was much more than this involved in the reconversion debate. Indeed, there was a studied effort to narrow the issue to unemployment compensation, to make it appear that labor was looking for some narrow advantage for itself.

The real issue from the start was whether Congress should proceed on the assumption that full employment and full production were feasible and worthwhile objectives, requiring government planning and aid. These objectives were explicitly stated in the Kilgore Bill, and carried over into the George Bill as passed by the Senate. But this statement of principles was deleted from the House bill by the Republicans and their allies on the House Ways and Means Committee.

The reason for this deletion was most frankly stated by Rep. Hamilton Fish, the notorious friend of Nazi agents who is the ranking Republican on the House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and therefore fully qualified to act as a spokesman on G.O.P. post-war policy. "You might as well remind the people in advance, who are receiving this enormous war wages and overtime, that after the war is over that will all disappear and we go back to normal American standards which are the highest of any country in the world." Fish said that he did not want to hold out "false promises" of a national income of $130,000,000 after the war or employment of more than 48,000,000, which means that Fish does hold out the promise of an unemployed army of some 10,000,000. In the do-nothing Hooverism of Congressional Republicans expressed in statements like this is to be found the real story of G.O.P. post-war policy.

Dewey is fully cognizant that the people do not trust him to do the job of winning the war, and so he has tried to emphasize that the war will be over by the time the new administration takes office and that he is just the man for the post-war

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

job. Dewey has come forward as the champion of free enterprise in the post-war period. But it is obvious that all Administration reconversion plans, starting with the Baruch report, are completely predicated on continuing and indeed on strengthening private enterprise. And it is a fact that the real threat to free enterprise would come in the economic chaos threatened by the Dewey-Hoover policies.

It is impossible to discuss Republican campaign strategy solely in terms of policy or even lack of policy. For it is altogether characteristic that Dewey should in one and the same speech repeat *Chicago Tribune* anti-United Nations slanders and endorse an international security organization or that he, as the leader of the party which killed legislation to plan reconversion, should condemn the Administration for lacking reconversion plans. There are, of course, underlying policies which are to be found in G.O.P. speeches and statements—opposition to Teheran and a do-nothing Hooverism on reconversion and post-war employment. But it is also necessary to grasp the fact that a reckless campaign to win at any cost is basic to the G.O.P. strategy. This explains the G.O.P. efforts to keep the vote light, the Republican opposition to the soldier vote bill, Bricker's attempt to void the ballots of servicemen who do not vote with an approved black pencil. And it explains the systematic effort to cultivate reactionary prejudices and disunity among the American people.

It is no accident that the Patterson-McCormick papers, which play so important a role in the Dewey propaganda machine, should perform the ghoulish function of attempting to persuade the American people that the President's health is daily getting worse. Dewey himself set the tone for this kind of campaign when he made the President's age a major issue in his acceptance speech.

Official G.O.P. propaganda has taken over most of the shop-worn defeatist slogans. And Dewey has increasingly veered closer to the McCormick-Patterson line. Once it was only the most defeatist Congressmen who said that the President was to blame for Pearl Harbor. But Bert Andrew, the well-informed chief of the *Herald Tribune* Washington Bureau, stated recently that a speech along this line by Rep. Hugh Scott, Pennsylvania Republican, was based on information furnished by higher-ups and was intended to lay the foundation for a real drive by Dewey on the question of Pearl Harbor guilt. Dewey has in fact already blamed the Administration for the alleged unpreparedness of the armed forces at the time of Pearl Harbor. This is, of course, a well-planned counter-offensive designed to take the sting out of well-deserved Administration charges against the Republican Congressmen and Senators who spoke and acted on the theory that the United States was secure from Axis attacks.

Dewey and Labor

By far the most important G.O.P.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effort to create disunity and dissension, by now one of the principal features of the entire Republican campaign, has been the all-out attack on the C.I.O. Political Action Committee—an attack that has been aided by the very substantial portion of the press backing Dewey. Republican leaders have attempted to build P.A.C. as a huge bogey which threatens to take over the Democratic Party and in fact the entire United States government. The objective of this campaign is to create divisions within the labor movement by pitting the A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods against the C.I.O., as well as the farmer against the worker, and creating distrust and hatred of the labor movement among the middle classes and business people of the nation. There has also been more than a touch of anti-Semitism and of incitement against the foreign-born in this Republican drive against P.A.C.

An integral part of the attempt to build up P.A.C. as a bogeyman has been a drive to link the C.I.O. in the public mind with the Communists. Official statements by the Republican National Committee have referred repeatedly to the "Browder-Hillman Axis." With the aid of the Dies Committee and Republican newspaper columnists, a wide-spread impression has been created that the P.A.C. is Communist-dominated.

This Red-baiting campaign goes beyond an effort to smear P.A.C. It is designed to make Communism a main issue in the campaign, to create the impression that President Roosevelt himself is a Communist or at the very least has strong Communist leanings. The Red-baiting campaign was officially initiated at the Republican convention by Rep. Joe Martin, G.O.P. leader in the House. "Do the American people want these radical organizations, with their avowed purpose to remake America, to control the Presidency, to secure a 'rubber stamp' Congress, and to dominate absolutely and completely our government?" Martin asked. And he declared that "no greater issue" has ever confronted the American people.

Martin himself illuminated the meaning of this Red-baiting drive when he endorsed Rep. Ham Fish for re-election as a "consistent foe of Communism." It is hardly necessary here to go into detail about Fish's connections with the Nazi agent, George Sylvester Viereck, or about his peregrinations in Ribbentrop's plane. And yet Martin endorsed Fish because he has opposed "Communism." The G.O.P. has officially taken over the classic "anti-Comintern" line with all its implications for our country. And this is one of the principal reasons for the enthusiastic support which the Dewey-Bricker ticket has received from the Hearst and Paterson-McCormick papers, as well as from all the assorted fascist groups in this country. Bricker made it clear that Gerald L. K. Smith's support was welcome, and Smith subsequently reciprocated by making Bricker his vice-presidential candidate. Dewey did belatedly repudiate both Fish and Gerald Smith, but only for their anti-Semtism and not for their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rounded fascist program. The anti-Communist drive of the G.O.P. is an index of its desperate and reckless demagogy in its drive for power, as well as of the extent of fascist penetration of the Republican Party during the course of this campaign.

In the face of the immense need for national unity for victory in the war and in the peace, the G.O.P. does not hesitate to split the country, set class against class, group against group, isolate and destroy those who are working most wholeheartedly for victory, and create an atmosphere of hostility toward our Soviet ally, as well as toward the many other members of the United Nations where united governments are arising that represent all the national resistance forces, including the Communists.

A speech by Rep. Carl Curtis of Nebraska on the House floor made it clear that the frenzied attack on the Communists is also intended as an attack on the policies of the Teheran conference. In what purported to be a discussion of the recent report by Eugene Dennis, vice-president of the Communist Political Association, to a Midwest conference of C.P.A. leaders, Curtis singled out passages from the report which pointed to the importance of mustering active support for the Teheran conference. "Why are the Communists so interested in the Teheran agreement?" Curtis asked. And then he added: "History will show that the Atlantic Charter was thrown in the discard at Teheran. History will show that the small freedom-loving nations of Eastern Europe were sold down the river at Teheran."

One Democratic Congressman indicated during Curtis's speech that there are many non-Communists who are by no means prepared to oppose a given policy simply because it is advocated by Communists. Curtis read a passage from the Dennis report stating that Roosevelt must be re-elected not because he is a Democrat but because he is "the foremost leader of the national interest" and to "insure the continuation of his leadership as the vital and successful head of our Nation's military effort, and as one of the greatest architects of the American-Soviet-British alliance, of the Moscow, Cairo and Teheran conferences, which guarantee the way toward victory, a durable peace, and post-war security." Suggesting that Curtis should discuss the Dennis report on its merits, Rep. George Sadowski of Michigan asked at this point: "Does the gentleman disagree with that statement?" Curtis did not answer the question.

In testimony before a House committee, Sidney Hillman made a significant effort to counteract the drive to isolate P.A.C. and picture it as a menace to other groups in the population. Hillman said that P.A.C. "has never acted alone, but always in conjunction with other progressive forces." He added: "To the extent that we have assisted in further developing the political consciousness of the American people, to that extent we believe that we are making a real contribution to the national welfare. But the job has not been ours alone. Many

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other groups and individuals have cooperated with us or engaged in parellel programs of their own."

There have in fact been encouraging developments along this line. The G.O.P. has made practically no inroads in the labor movement, despite the frantic efforts of men like John L. Lewis and William L. Hutcheson. Daniel Tobin of the Teamsters, head of the Democratic Labor Committee, has made it plain that he proposes to work with P.A.C. and every other group which is for the election of the President. Under men like Tobin and of A. F. Whitney of the Railroad Trainmen, A. F. of L. and railroad unions are in many cases joining with the C.I.O. or forming, on their own, political committees for the re-election of Roosevelt.

Some Republicans, including former Governor Pinchot of Pennsylvania, are rallying to the Roosevelt banner. And while Wendell Willkie has up to this writing made no endorsement, his forthright criticisms of the Republican platform have no doubt made many G.O.P. voters think along independent and pro-Roosevelt lines.

On the other hand, it would be a mistake to underestimate the effectiveness of the G.O.P. campaign, which is well-heeled with campaign contributions from important industrialists and has the support of about two-thirds of the nation's press. The fact must be faced that Dewey has won substantial support among farmers, among small-town communities, and among middle-class groups. The Republicans are resorting to every form of demagogy in making a serious bid for the Negro vote. They are placing major reliance on the promise of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee and on Dewey's appointment of Negroes to important positions in the New York State Administration. Actually, the G.O.P. record in Congress in connection with funds for even the temporary F.E.P.C. established by the President has been generally one of opposition. The Republicans know that any measure for a permanent F.E.P.C. would meet with a filibuster in the Senate from the poll-taxers. As in the case of the anti-poll tax bill, the Republicans, working hand in glove with the poll-taxers, would be able to block the F.E.P.C. measure in disguised fashion by opposing a cloture vote. They are thus safe in promising a permament F.E.P.C. Dewey's own record in connection with projected anti-discrimination measures in New York State is well known. He sidetracked proposals drawn up by his own Committee Against Discrimination during the recent session of the Legislature by proposing another commission for "further study."

As far as appointments are concerned, outstanding Negro leaders from all walks of life warned, in a manifesto issued some months ago, that the Negro people will not be bribed with jobs for a few.

Dewey has tried to make inroads into labor's ranks; but his efforts have not carried him far. In his Seattle speech he took his arguments both from John L. Lewis and from the Republican platform in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his attempt to undermine the support the President is receiving from the working class.

He attacked the whole wage stabilization policy as a political move of the President to dictate wages and hours as a means of dominating the unions. This is precisely what Lewis has been saying in his struggle against all war measures. Dewey's position also follows the G.O.P. platform demand that all war-time labor controls virtually be eliminated, a demand that even Walter Lippmann, leading commentator of the Republican *New York Herald Tribune*, called "mischievous" and "irresponsible," because of the disastrous effect such action would have on the war effort. Dewey evidently "forgot," incidentally, when he charged that the President dominated labor, that the Republican cry is the other way round; labor is supposed to be dominating the President.

The G.O.P. candidate presented a "four-point program" in his labor speech. Aside from a repetition of the meaningless promise to appoint a Secretary of Labor "from the ranks of labor," which doubtless means the appointment of a Woll or a Hutcheson, the program is composed of vague generalities that actually carry a threat to labor. Thus, he calls for establishing "equality" among business, labor, and farmers. Since, in the G.O.P. view, labor has won all kinds of "special privileges" for itself, this has a distinct anti-labor sound. Dewey's emphasis, in his speech, on "free" collective bargaining, also has distinct anti-labor overtones in view of the constant plea of anti-labor employers that the closed shop and the outlawing of company unions interfere with "freedom" of the workers.

Dewey's final point is a demagogic statement that he is for full employment at higher wage levels. The essence of Dewey's and the G.O.P.'s program to give the most reactionary section of the monopolists a free hand, to block the constructive reconversion program of the Administration, and to oppose international economic collaboration exposes the G.O.P.'s high-toned promises to labor and the people, as reactionary Hooverism.

Just as he tried to blame the President for the depression of the 1930's, so Dewey attempts, in his labor speech, to picture the President as the foe of labor and the G.O.P. as its friend. He resorts to outright fraud by describing the Administration-sponsored Wagner Labor Relations Act as "bipartisan" and blaming the Smith-Connally Act on the "New Deal." It should be noted, in passing, that he makes no promise to repeal the Smith-Connally Act if elected. Actually, of course, Dewey's chief backers—reactionary sections of the industrialists—have fought the National Labor Relations Act bitterly, and Republicans in Congress have frequently tried to emasculate it by amendment. As for the Smith-Connally Act, it was passed with the support of the bulk of the Republicans, vetoed by the President, and passed over his veto again by the votes of an almost solid Republican bloc.

Dewey also tries to exploit weak-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nesses in the Administration of war labor policy, specifically the delays in National War Labor Board procedure. While there are undoubtedly grievances on that score, labor generally is quite aware of the fact that the G.O.P. record carries a threat that must be defeated. It remembers clearly the days of company thugs, labor spies, injunctions, frame-ups, company unions, the use of troops against workers, and numerous other forms of repression under the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover regimes.

It is fully as conscious of the marked contrast under the Roosevelt Administration, wherein trade-union membership grew from 3,000,000 to 14,000,000, to organize politically, to gain social security, minimum wages and many other benefits, as well as recognition as an independent force in American life that cannot be ignored.

The G.O.P. effort to isolate labor and particularly the C.I.O., confronts the labor movement with serious problems which have not yet been solved by a campaign along sufficiently broad and non-partisan lines. Another aspect of the same problem is posed by the success of the G.O.P. in lining up important sections of finance capital for the Dewey-Bricker ticket. Dennis pointed out in his report that this makes it all the more imperative for labor to work in the broadest and most non-partisan manner so as "to break up the unstable coalition now supporting Dewey and Bricker and to influence important sections of Big Business now lined up with the G.O.P. to participate in or go along with the camp of national unity after the elections."

Getting Out the Vote

The Gallup Poll has given Roosevelt a slight lead, and the *Fortune* poll has given the President a somewhat larger advantage. But these polls also show that the race is still too close for comfort. The danger signals sent up by Dennis in his recent report cannot be withdrawn as yet.

There are perhaps three major problems which must be solved to assure an overwhelming victory for the Roosevelt-Truman ticket. First, to conduct the campaign in a non-partisan manner so as to strengthen the national unity and mobilize maximum support behind the President for winning the war speedily and for carrying through the post-war objectives projected at Teheran. Roosevelt and Truman have contributed to this approach in their speeches. Second, to conduct a vigorous educational campaign to acquaint the people with the issues and to expose the reckless demagogy of the G.O.P. candidate. There have been serious weaknesses in the campaign in this respect, particularly on the part of the Democratic National Committee. Third, there is the job of registration, which is still lagging in many crucial areas. The solution to this problem may well hold the key to the election, since it is generally conceded by the Gallup poll and other surveys that Dewey can win only if there is a light vote.

The urgency of giving close and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

systematic attention to the question of registration and of guarding against the danger arising from a mood of over-confidence among the pro-Roosevelt forces, including labor, was forcefully stressed by Earl Browder in *The Worker* of September 17, when he said:

"It will do no good to have a majority in the country, however large, if it is not registered at the polls on election day. And there are many signs of the continuance of a heavy inertia in registration and voting. It is a fact that among those who fail to register and vote about 80 per cent are Roosevelt supporters, because it is these who face the greatest obstacles to voting; they are the workers who have followed war industry, the young voters, especially those who are casting their first ballots, and the men in the services. Dewey's hope of election lies in a small total vote, in which he will register approximately his full strength, while the President will register only a fraction of his. There is yet no guarantee that the Dewey calculation will not work out. . . .

"The problem of the election, therefore, is in the first place one of avoiding overconfidence arising from the strong national trend for Roosevelt. It is a problem of activity and organization among all circles and strata of the population who understand the vital necessity of Roosevelt being at the helm to finish the war and organize the peace of the world. They must make sure that every potential vote is realized at the polls in November.

"The current of history runs with the broad and all-inclusive camp of Roosevelt supporters. But the great danger is the temptation to merely ride the current, when the need is for strong swimming.

"Hard work and systematic work is the need of the hour. Let overconfidence and complacency be dissolved."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

BY ALEX BITTELMAN

FOR an issue in the campaign against the Roosevelt administration, the Republican Party high command has picked private enterprise as against what it chooses to call the bureaucracy or the socialism, the regimentation, the fascism of the New Deal. The keynote for this was set at the Republican national convention by Hoover, Martin and Dewey and was further emphasized in the second party platform elaborated by the conference of Republican governors. Since then everything in Republican circles seems to be geared to making this issue one of the major lines of attack in the effort to elect Dewey and Bricker.

To Republican leaders it apparently matters little that free private enterprise is not at all an issue in this election campaign. They are determined to try to make it an issue, nevertheless. Nor are they apparently fully aware of the fact that if they succeed in forcing free enterprise as a major issue in the elections, they run the risk of themselves becoming exposed as enemies of real free private enterprise. For the fact of the matter is that the defenders and upholders of all the most reactionary features of monopoly in business, the features that stifle and crush the free development of private enterprise, are precisely the reactionary monopolist forces dominating the Republican Party. Suffice it at this point merely to mention the most recent and current demonstration of this truth, namely, the opposition of the Hoover-Dewey leadership to planned and orderly reconversion, as provided by the Kilgore-Murray Bill, because among other things such reconversion would enable new capital and independent business to enter the field of competition with certain groups of monopolies.

Thus it becomes important once more to examine the question of government intervention in the national economy. And from this angle: is government intervention in the national economy compatible with free private enterprise—with capitalism? Is it true that economic government intervention destroys the capitalist system? What in general is the economic role of the state?

Different Roles in Different Systems and Periods

Since the origin of the state, it has always had a part to play in the economic life of the community, a part of one kind or another. In

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other words, since the origin of government there always was government economic intervention. Only under different social and economic systems the nature and degree of such intervention were different. Moreover, even under the same social system—say, capitalism—the character and degree of government economic intervention were different under the different stages of development of that system.

Roughly, under capitalism state economic intervention was very active generally at the very birth and first phase of that system and continued active at all times for the "protection" of young and new industries. State economic support and intervention played a decisive part in the launching and initial development of modern banking and of nearly every basic industry, especially those like the railroads whose returns on investments were of a long-term character, or in which foreign competition was intense, like shipping or air transportation. And again in the latest phase of capitalist development, as distinct from its phase of free competition, when government economic intervention was generally at a minimum, the state began to play an increasing part in economic processes and regulations. This was true in the United States under Republican as well as Democratic administrations; and if any substantial difference can be noted, it is this: that under Republican administrations the selfish interests of certain monopolistic groups were aided and protected by government intervention more stubbornly and recklessly, taking the period since after the civil war until the conclusion of the Hoover administration.

Of decisive importance has always been the economic role of the state under capitalism in preparation for war, during war and in the period of demobilization. And these periods have taken a good deal of the total lifetime of the capitalist system, during which time various countries were living under various forms of military state capitalism.

With all that, the thing to remember is that during all these periods and times of economic government intervention under capitalism, the social and economic system continued capitalist and did not become something else in kind or in substance. Private ownership of the means of production remained the basis of the system and private enterprise the prevailing mode of economic operation although modified and regulated by the state for war purposes or some large economic purposes, regulated by government in which private enterprise played a decisive if not exclusive role.

The Hoover-Dewey leadership of the Republican Party knows all of this, of course. But to admit it would mean abandoning what looks to it like a good issue against Roosevelt. Hence, the efforts of Hoover, Dewey, etc. to declare our present war economy "totalitarian," "socialistic" and "fascist," and to organize a crusade "for a return to free enterprise." And this goes hand in hand with a Hoover-Dewey reconversion policy which seeks to freeze the pre-war economic monopoly positions of certain reactionary groups

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of industrialists supporting the Republican candidates, at the expense of business as a whole, directed particularly against expansion of industry and the inflow of new enterprise capital—a performance which should fully expose the monumental hypocrisy of these so-called defenders of free enterprise, in fact of its enemies who seek to stifle and crush it.

Yet, there is also this involved here. It will be recalled that the Hoover-Dewey combination has always been careful not to disclose its full opposition to the Roosevelt economic policies — the policies which enabled the United States to build up in an amazingly short time the magnificent economic war machine that is helping to make it possible for us and our allies to win the war. In fact, Hoover and Dewey wish to be known as supporting these policies of the president. Only —and here is the key to something of importance — the assertion is made by Hoover and Dewey that in adopting the President's economic war policies we have abandoned our system of free private enterprise, that we have become totalitarian. They add that "perhaps" this was unavoidable under war conditions but that the New Deal is aggravating the "totalitarian" features of our war economy and threatens to make them permanent unless defeated in the coming national elections.

Significant here is the Hoover-Dewey opposition to our war economy, an economy without which the war could not be won under the present set-up. But equally important is the implied attitude that the system of private enterprise is incapable of serving the aims of a war of national liberation, that it is incapable of serving a national purpose even at a time when the future of the nation is at stake. This is what Hoover and Dewey seem to be saying here when they declare that the government's intervention in the building up of our war economy meant the abandonment of the American system of free enterprise. This is tantamount to saying that in order to win the war the United States had to give up the capitalist mode of production. Which is nonsense, of course, but very revealing of the Hoover-Dewey mentality. It reveals a total inability to think in economic terms of national interest and the national good. It reveals a complete absorption in the narrow and selfish interests of certain reactionary and pro-fascist groups of monopolists, so much so that Hoover and Dewey cannot even conceive of the capitalist mode of production being capable of lending itself to serving a national purpose in a war for our national existence and independence.

No Communist, the most consistent believer in the eventual establishment of socialism, has ever maintained that the winning of the war required the abolition of the capitalist mode of production. Communists took the position, fully confirmed by events, that on the basis of national unity for victory in the war of liberation, we can mobilize the national economy for the war without overstepping the bounds of the existing system of private enter-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prise. Similarly, Earl Browder has developed the position further, following the historic decisions of the Teheran Conference, in order to take care of the economic problems of demobilization, reconversion and peace. He demonstrated that on the basis of continued national unity after victory, to realize the decisions and perspective of Teheran, it will be possible to achieve a successful economic mobilization for peace—wide prosperity and economic security for the American people—within the confines of the existing system of private enterprise. This will require considerable government participation and economic intervention, not to compete with private enterprise but to enable it to realize fully all business possibilities at home and abroad. And this will make our economic system just as little socialist as does our present war economy.

State economic intervention by itself does not make socialism, be that intervention much or little. In pre-capitalist times, the state often intervened very intimately—and arbitrarily—in the economic processes of the community, but that state was feudal, not socialist. Also, under fascism, state economic intervention takes on considerable proportions, but the social result obviously is not socialism, but a fantastic accentuation and combination of all the most reactionary features of monopoly capitalism and landlord feudalism spelling virtual slavery for the masses of the people, and reckless enrichment for a small clique of fascist chieftains, big industrialists and landlords.

The role of the state under socialism is altogether and qualitatively different from that under capitalism or any other social system. And a clear understanding of this fact would also help to throw more light on the nature and possibilities of government intervention under capitalism.

The Economic Role of the Soviet State

On this question a group of Soviet economists has produced a clarification and statement of position which has already proven its great value, although many distortions of it have appeared in certain American newspapers in the process of reporting as well as commenting. In discussing the economic role of the Soviet state, the economists proceed from the following:

"Our state plays in the whole life of society, and consequently in its economic life, a substantially different role from any other state. Some superficial observers, for instance many foreign journalists and economists, try to reduce this whole difference to a merely quantitative distinction, that is, the Soviet state, so they say, 'interferes more' in economic life than do the other modern states. Certainly this by no means exhausts the matter. We refer to the fundamental qualitative difference, the fact that under socialism the state plays a role that is in principle different from all preceding modes of production."*

The fundamental determining factor here is, of course, the ownership of the means of production.

* *Political Economy in the Soviet Union*, International Publishers, New York, 1944, pp. 25-26.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Under socialism the means of production are owned by society as a whole, being therefore the property of the state. Hence, the state is able to plan for the entire economy and to organize all necessary economic functions. It is fundamentally different under our system of private enterprise. The means of production are privately owned, and this already introduces a basic limitation to what the state can do in the economic sphere.

Under our present system, the government is able to regulate certain economic processes. It can hasten the process of concentration of industry or it can exert a retarding influence. It can accentuate the reactionary features of monopoly or it can weaken them. It can help bring about economic collaboration between various economic groups and social classes for a common national purpose in a great emergency, or it can prevent such collaboration. It can also intensify a maturing economic crisis, or it can delay its outbreak and even weaken its force. Finally, it can participate directly in industry and business, *under certain limited conditions,* either by itself or in partnership with private enterprise.

In both England and in the United States, outstanding capitalist countries, government has played an economic role of the above character, and fully within the limitations of private enterprise, under conditions of high concentration and centralization of industry. In England a little more than here, but the principle of the thing is the same, whereas it is fundamentally different from the planning and organizing role of the Soviet state where a socialist mode of production prevails. Here is how the Soviet economists describe this role:

"The Soviet state is a tremendous economic force. It performs an enormous economic-organizational job that embraces all sides of the development of society. The planned conduct of the national economy, the realization of a nationwide accounting and control over the measure of work and the measure of consumption, the securing of the economic needs of the country's defense, the protection of social property—a list of only the most important functions gives one a notion of the volume and significance of the work carried on by the Soviet state in a socialist system of national economy." *

But the role of the Soviet state is not arbitrary. It cannot just go ahead and do anything it pleases in the economy of the country, since the socialist system, like all previous systems, develops according to certain laws. And it is with these laws, and in accordance with them, that the Soviet state operates and fulfills its economic role. On this point the Soviet economists have introduced a number of important clarifications.

They say:

"It is an elementary truth that a society, of no matter what type, develops according to definite laws based on objective necessity. This objective necessity manifests itself in different ways in different types of society. Under capitalism objec-

* *Ibid.*, p. 27.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive necessity operates as a spontaneous economic law, manifesting itself, through innumerable deviations, in catastrophes and cataclysms, in the destruction of productive forces."*

Objective necessity under capitalism operates more or less as a blind force which is generally out of control. It is different under socialism. Here objective necessity

". . . operates as an economic law which is conditioned by all the external and internal circumstances peculiar to that society, by all the historical premises of its development; but this objective necessity is perceived by the people, has come through the consciousness and the will of the people, that is, the builders of socialist society, those who guide and direct the power of that society—the Soviet state—and the Communist Party which guides the whole activity of the toiling masses."**

Under socialism the economic laws of its development are understood *and consciously applied by the Soviet state* in the practice of socialist construction. Objective necessity is no longer a blind and destructive force but controlled and controllable for the good of society.

Various enemies of socialism maintain that the Soviet state is interfering too much in the socialist economy. To these the Soviet economists have this to say:

"It is known that enemies of socialism of various brands—bourgeois economist-wreckers, restorers of capitalism from the camp of the Trotskyist-Bukharinist agency of fascism—have attempted to carry over to the socialist economy the laws of capitalist economy." *

It is from these enemy sources that we get the assertions that the Soviet state is exercising "arbitrary power" in the price structure of the socialist economy and in its wage structure. These attacks take different forms although flowing from the same general attitude which seeks to restore capitalist relations in the Soviet Union. On the one hand, it is claimed that the price policies of the Soviet government are "dictatorial," bearing no relation to the value of commodities and to market conditions, being determined completely by the "political" needs of the Soviet state. On the other hand, it is asserted that in its wage policies the Soviet government prefers to hold rigidly to the law of value and to the principle: from each according to his ability, to each according to his work.

The clarifications by the Soviet economists on these questions are of enormous practical value, also to us who live under a system of private enterprise.

First, it is necessary to bear in mind that in the socialist economy of the Soviet Union "there are as a matter of fact two markets and two kinds of prices." ** One is the market on which the Soviet government or its organs sell in an organized way the bulk of the goods owned by the state and at prices fixed by the state. The other is the unorganized market selling

* *Ibid.*, p. 24.
** *Ibid.*, p. 24.

* *Ibid.*, p. 22.
** *Ibid.*, p. 37.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

goods owned by individuals at prices that are formed on the market itself. In this discussion we are concerned with prices that are fixed by the state, and the first thing to say is that it is absolutely untrue that the Soviet government fixes prices "arbitrarily," by sheer force, so to speak.

In fixing prices, as well as in all other economic functions, the Soviet state operates with and utilizes the law of value, which is a law of economic development also under socialism but operating differently than under capitalism or pre-capitalist systems, to which we shall return presently. Hence, the next step in price fixing becomes the establishment of the "socially necessary expenses incurred in the production" * of commodities. With this as a basis, two main considerations determine the setting of prices: "that of socialist accumulation and that of raising of the material well-being and cultural level of the toiling masses." ** Finally, price fixing would also be influenced by the quantity of goods available and the social demand. This is price fixing *on the basis of the laws of socialist development.*

On the question of distribution of the products of the national economy, the Soviet state is guided, as is well known, by the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work." This principle arises inevitably from the nature of a socialist society which is characterized as follows:

"It is a society at a certain level of development of productive forces, a level high enough to make it possible to control the productive forces of society as a whole, to take them in hand, and to eliminate exploitation, but inadequate for the achievement of that high productivity of labor, that abundance of products which is required for the realization of the principle of distribution according to needs, for the full satisfaction of all the needs of the people."*

There is nothing arbitrary therefore in adhering to this principle of distribution in a socialist society whose economic capabilities are adequate for the abolition of exploitation and insecurity but as yet inadequate for the application of the Communist principle of distribution where each receives according to his needs.

At this point the argument is usually made by enemies of socialism that the Soviet government is taking away too large a portion of the total national product for social savings and reinvestment for expansion, and that this is supposedly being done at the expense of the current needs of the masses of the people. It is claimed that the Soviet government is devoting too much of the nation's labor to accumulation, proportionately much more than do capitalist economies. And this is being said in praise of capitalism and in condemnation of Soviet economic policy.

But here again, putting aside the slanderous and malicious nature of many of these criticisms, the basic

* *Ibid.*, p. 38.
** *Ibid.*, p. 38.

* *Ibid.*, p. 30.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact is that Soviet policy in the matter of accumulation and reinvestment for expansion is guided by the twin laws of socialist development which are: socialist industrialization and collectivization of agriculture. The needs of these two developments, without which there would be no socialism, dictated the policies of accumulation which at no time were in fundamental conflict with the Soviet policy of steadily raising the material and cultural standards of the people.

Moreover, it is certainly clear by this time that the successful development of socialist industrialization and collectivization of agriculture (the historic 5-year plans) was primarily responsible for the strength of the Soviet Union in the war against the Nazis; and for the eventual victory over this enemy of mankind, the freedom loving peoples will give thanks also to Soviet industrial power and the policies of "accumulation" of the Soviet state.

From an economic standpoint, much of what has been said before is closely linked with the question of how the law of value operates in a socialist economy. Here, too, the Soviet economists have made some very important clarifications, chiefly, that the law of value does operate in socialist economy but differently from capitalist or pre-capitalist societies. For under socialism, the state "has taken over the law of value, and consciously uses its mechanism (money, trade, prices, etc.) in the interests of socialism, for the purposes of the planned guidance of the national economy."*

The starting point here is the fact that "the labor of members of a socialist society creates commodities"** which are bought and sold at certain prices constituting the monetary expression of their value. Socialism does not do away with trade and money but makes use of these instrumentalities of commodity production for the development of the socialist economy. And where there is commodity production, there the law of value operates.

Further, the distinction between intellectual and physical labor (skilled and unskilled) still exists under socialism although the fundamental contradiction between the two has disappeared. Similarly with the differences between town and country, industrial and farm labor. Here too the fundamental age-long contradictions have disappeared under socialism but the differences still continue.

This means that the Socialist state has the task of determining prices of commodities and then wages for labor on the principle that each receives according to his work. And this can be done only on the basis of the law of value and with the help of its instrumentalities, namely, that labor in a socialist society creates use values (articles of consumption) and also value, the embodiment of general labor which makes possible the comparison and exchange of different articles of consumption. This makes also ne-

* *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.
** *Ibid.*, p. 36.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cessary the use of such tools as trade, money, prices, etc.

But the commodity in socialist economy is free of the contradictions inherent in it in capitalist and pre-capitalist economy, namely, the contradiction between use value and value, between individual and social labor. The work of the individual worker under socialism is directly social in character (he works for society), what he produces is socially necessary and is needed and used by society. There is no capitalist to appropriate another man's labor, the worker receiving payment according to his work. Hence

"It follows that the commodity [under socialism] is no longer the bearer of those contradictions which in their further development inevitably lead to the rise of capitalist exploitation, to crises, etc." *

The law of value, as can be seen from the foregoing, does operate in socialist society, but undergoes a transformation in two vital respects. Under capitalism the law of value directs in a blind and unorganized fashion the distribution of social labor and means of production (labor and capital) to the various branches of the national economy; under socialism this is carried out in a planned and organized way according to the needs of the people and the basic tasks of socialist construction. Then, under capitalism the law of value operates through the law of the average rate of profit, that is, businessmen invest where profits are highest and discontinue business (or go bankrupt) when their profits fall below the average rate. Under socialism, the law of average profits simply means nothing. And for this reason:

"In socialist society the overwhelming mass of enterprises are national possessions, *i.e.*, they belong to a single owner, the Soviet state. Thanks to this, the Soviet state is able to carry on production from the standpoint of the basic interests of socialism, without bowing to the law that one cannot develop a line of production which during the initial stages of operation yields a loss or does not yield a profit." *

It should also be noted that under socialism, labor power, land and the means of production *are no longer commodities*. Even though they have a money value, they can be neither bought nor sold. This is so because of "the predominance of social ownership of the means of production." ** Hence, while the law of value operates in a transformed way, the rise of class exploitation is prevented by the social ownership of the means of production, whereas under the prevalence of private ownership the operation of the law of value inevitably produces and reproduces exploitation of man by man.

Finally, it is important to see the course of historical development of the operation of the law of value under socialism. The Soviet economists have demonstrated that "only in the highest phase of communism" *** will the law of value be overcome since the productivity of labor will have developed to such

* *Ibid.*, p. 40.

* *Ibid.*, p. 41.
** *Ibid.*, p. 42.
*** *Ibid.*, p. 42.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a degree and society will have at its disposal such an abundance of goods that the distribution of goods according to need will become possible." *

From the foregoing it should already be obvious that under socialism, too, the workers produce more than is required for the immediate satisfaction of their needs, that is, they produce a surplus product. This is so, of course, in every society since the primitive communal, but enemies of socialism have distorted also this phase of Soviet economy by misrepresenting the surplus product as exploitation. But what is the truth?

The truth is that in the Soviet Union exploitation of human beings has been abolished, and both the surplus product and surplus labor (labor beyond what is needed for the immediate consumption of the personal wants of the producers) are not appropriated parasitically by exploiters.

"Socialism in the U.S.S.R. has put an end to the parasitic consumption of the leisure classes, which meant the plundering of the fruits of the surplus labor of the workers and peasants." **

Yet, what happens to the surplus labor? Part of it goes into social savings, into accumulation for expanded reproduction, for the expansion of the national economy. Another part goes to the current needs of society as a whole, for example, national defense. Still another goes to insure and realize such rights of the Soviet citizens as education, leisure, social security and maintenance of health, all of which is a responsibility of the Soviet state.

In other words, as Lenin remarked, "the surplus product goes, not to a class of owners, but to all toilers, and to them only." *

These are indeed very important clarifications that the Soviet economists have made, for the good of their own educational programs in the matter of political economy, for the good of all interested in social progress, and to the benefit of all students of political economy, regardless of ideology. But to the *New York Times* these clarifications seemed to have proved a source of phenomenal confusion. This very respectable newspaper began to see all sorts of visions, such as "a new capitalism" in Russia, "a changing Russia," "new wine in old bottles," "a Soviet revision of Marx," "Communist dogmas basically revised," etc., etc. True, these are only the headlines of articles and editorials from the *New York Times*, but the contents of these items are precisely what the headlines say and just as truthful or profound.

Why the *New York Times*, and a few others, should have become so badly confused is not difficult to understand. The people directing this paper simply wanted it to be so. It was a case of the wish being father to the thought. The *New York Times* and the people it rep-

* *Ibid.*, p. 42.
** *Ibid.*, p. 45.

* Leninski Sbornik (Lenin Collection), Vol. XI, p. 382, Russian ed.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resents have still not fully made up their minds that the collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union is a collaboration between two different social systems, between a capitalist state and a socialist state, and that there is no use wishing it were different. The anti-Hitler coalition and the United Nations rest on reality, not on illusions and therein lies their strength.

Earl Browder has pointed that out long ago (in *Victory—And After)* and the majority of the American people, including most thoughtful capitalists, are taking the same view. In fact, it is beginning to be widely realized that the strength of the anti-Hitler coalition, its great capacities in the war against the fascists and for organizing the peace after victory, lies precisely in the fact that this new historical phenomenon is a combination of all freedom and peace loving peoples of many ideologies, religions and ultimate programs; that it is a combination of states of *varying and different social systems* and that it includes as its base the greatest capitalist states and the socialist state, the capitalist system and the socialist system. Herein lies the strength of the United Nations and its promise for the future.

This the *New York Times* will have to learn, as many others have. And if it cannot learn from the Communists, it certainly should be able to do so from Eric A. Johnston, President of the United States Chamber of Commerce, who has acquired, on the whole, a realistic view of our relations with the Soviet Union, relations between a capitalist state and a socialist state, based upon the fundamental national interests of both countries and absolutely indispensable to the peace of the world and its economic prosperity. This is the key to the strength and potency of the Teheran agreements and the perspectives arising from them.

We have thus seen more clearly than hitherto, thanks to the clarifications of the Soviet economists, that the economic role of the state in a socialist society—the Soviet state—is qualitatively different from that in a capitalist society. We have seen, that is, that government economic intervention by itself does not make socialism, that also under capitalism much government intervention in the national economy takes place from time to time within the confines and on the basis of private ownership of the means of production and of private enterprise in their operation. And no amount of partisan and reactionary "issue-making" by the Hoover-Dewey combination can change this truth, although some people may be misled. Hence, the need of discussion on the economic role of the American government in the transition to peace after victory and in the first phases of the peace itself.

Government Participation in the Economics of Peace

There is an important role to be played by the American government in the economic affairs of our country in the transition to peace and in its establishment. But this will be realized only in the measure in which the American people de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feat the reactionary "philosophies" and lines of policy of the Hoover-Dewey combination for whom even the Kilgore Bill is "state socialism" (Taft).

It should be stressed first of all that at the present time, the time of securing victory in the war and organizing the basis for peace, economics and politics are so intimately interwoven that none can move without the other. War and peace are always made by governments, but at no time in the past did the economic future of the world and of America depend so much upon the realization of our government's war and peace program, the program of Teheran. This it is that determines, in the first place, that the American government has a large part to play in the economics of the peace. In fact, it is already playing it, and with considerable success, in such matters as world food problems, currency stabilization and credit, relief and rehabilitation, some special problems of world trade, etc. The thing to make sure of is that the Hoover-Dewey combination does not succeed in reversing or even checking this process.

Discussing the elements of an economic program for the peace, Earl Browder has this to say on present-day relations between economics and politics.

"Political programs must in the final analysis find their foundation in economics; and an economic program must find its expression in a political framework. The political and economic aspects of life are mutually inter-related in the closest fashion, and any changes in one almost always result in corresponding adjustments in the other. It is necessary to repeat this truism, for the benefit of those vulgarians who speak glibly of the 'purely political' character of the concord of Teheran" (*Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace*, page 74).

The nature of the peace will condition the course of our economic life for many years. We may have economic crisis and catastrophe or the unfoldment of a period of economic well-being and prosperity depending upon the failure or success in realizing the possibilities of the Teheran concord. But to realize these possibilities means to organize not only military and political collaboration between the United Nations but also economic collaboration, economic collaboration between nations. This will be carried through in the United States primarily by private enterprise, and on the basis of the existing system of private ownership of the means of production, *but with government participation,* under government supervision and with considerable government assistance.

How much of such government intervention we will have to have for our national prosperity will depend a good deal upon how much private enterprise itself will succeed in coping with the post-war economic tasks. It will also depend upon the degree of national unity, as built around President Roosevelt, that will prevail in post-war: the more of this unity, the less government intervention, and the more voluntary cooperation between

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business, labor and agriculture *under government leadership*. Also the forms of government participation will depend upon the foregoing developments. But whatever the degree and forms of government intervention to insure the realization of the economic possibilities of the Teheran concord for economic well-being and prosperity, government participation and leadership will be absolutely imperative.

Take the two most basic economic problems of the transition to peace and its intial phases: demobilization-reconversion and foreign trade. An examination of these problems discloses that none can be solved successfully without active government participation. If the American people were to listen to the Tafts and Vandenbergs, which they would not, we would surely be heading into economic catastrophe and political convulsions.

On reconversion we have the position embodied in the Kilgore-Celler Bill, which, though rejected by the majorities in both Houses, remains the fundamental position of the majority of the American people. The essence of this position is that it undertakes to organize, under government direction, a planned and orderly transition to a peace economy, seeking to lay the basis for a full mobilization of our nation's resources to expand and further develop our economic opportunities. It is a plan to enable the American people to do as great an economic job in peace as they did in war for the welfare and prosperity of America on the basis of the existing system of private enterprise and the private ownership of the means of production. But to Senators Taft and Vandenberg, this is "state socialism" and therefore no good.

There are three main tasks of reconversion which the Kilgore-Celler Bill undertakes to solve. First, the coordination and unification of postwar economic planning by private agencies and government bodies, for which a government policy-making body should be created, the Office of War Mobilization and Adjustment. As part of this general body of planning, there would be a Production Employment Board, an advisory agency, consisting of representatives of industry, labor and agriculture. Second, the actual direction of industrial demobilization and reconversion is placed in the hands of the War Production Board to be in full charge of cancellation of war contracts aided by a production adjustment committee made up of representatives of the main procurement agencies. The War Production Board would determine and supervise the rate of transition to civilian production on the basis of keeping the door open to new capital and newcomers in industry (encouraging private enterprise) and protecting the rights of independent firms and small business. Third, the great job of retraining and reemployment is to be handled by a special administration with a Work Administrator. Here the Federal government assumes responsibility to our brave servicemen and to our war workers for retraining for civilian employment, for bringing the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worker to the job, for interim placement benefits to each qualified worker until a job is found, with the combination of the established unemployment insurance system. Also special provisions are made for stimulating the development of housing projects and public works.

Dewey has attacked this program as offering the workers the dole instead of jobs, thus seeking to justify the conduct of the Republicans in Congress who, together with the poll-tax Democrats, have so far succeeded in blocking the only sound plan for reconversion, the one embodied in the Kilgore-Celler Bill.

Examine the principles of that bill more closely and you will find that it provides a means of solving every major difficulty and of protecting every legitimate major interest involved in the transition to a peace economy. For instance: it makes sure that new capital, independent firms and small business have a fair chance of entering the field of civilian production in the process of reconversion without in any way curtailing the opportunities of the older firms and big corporations and monopolies. Here, too, the bill seeks to make sure that such relatively new industrial regions as the South and the Pacific Coast shall have their own opportunities for further industrial development instead of being sacrificed to the selfish interests of the corporations in the older industrial regions in the northeastern and middle western states.

Admittedly, these are difficult and complicated tasks of sound reconversion, but they must be tackled and solved or else we shall not utilize our economic opportunities, and instead of prosperity we shall have depression, crisis and chaos. The Kilgore Bill offers a way of solving these tasks and proposes to mobilize the capacities of America *for a program of unprecedented economic peacetime expansion,* whereas the Hoover-Dewey opponents of the bill orientate toward a *shrinking* economy, with depressions, crises and mass unemployment, with sharp internal conflicts of group against group, class against class, with a government power crushing the will of everybody to the benefit of a select group of monopolistic industrialists, defeatists and pro-fascists, among the supporters of the Hoover-Dewey leadership.

It is not true, it is a Hitler lie, that the Republican opponents of the Kilgore reconversion plan—the plan of the Roosevelt administration—are championing free enterprise. Hoover & Co. would indeed like us to believe that they stand out for a "free for all" competition and equal opportunity for all businessmen in the transition to civilian production. But to do what Hoover-Dewey want in the matter of reconversion *would mean using government power to keep new capital out of civilian industry after the war and to create a standing army of unemployed of many, many millions, without jobs and without support.* That would mean government economic intervention, all right, but for what purpose? Not in the national interest, not even in the interests of business as a class

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or of big business as a group. Not at all. It would be for the purpose of stifling and crushing private enterprise, for the purpose of destroying the purchasing power of the masses so essential for our industry, and doing so *by government power,* for the enrichment of the small clique of pro-fascist monopolists that are the real inspiration of the Hoover-Dewey combination.

The Kilgore Bill provisions will require the further development and continuation of national unity, as championed by President Roosevelt, as a guarantee of successful reconversion. This means that capital, labor and agriculture will have to work jointly with the government to realize the opportunities for economic expansion. This means also that big and small business, old capital and new capital, corporations and independents—all will have to work together, to plan together and *to share together* the great economic opportunities for expansion and advancement. And this can be realized at present only with government participation and leadership, jointly with agriculture and labor, on the basis of private ownership of the means of production and the operation of private enterprise.

Obviously, this necessitates a certain measure of political regrouping among business circles along the lines of continuing national unity for economic expansion on the basis of the Teheran concord. How much of this is now taking place, cannot as yet be clearly defined, but the process is there and the more certain it becomes that Roosevelt will be re-elected, the stronger this realignment will grow. That the masses of the people, with labor outstanding among them, and a considerable section of business, are determined to back the policy of continuing national unity around Roosevelt for expanded prosperity and the maintenance of peace, of this there can be little doubt. Hence the perfectly valid stress by the camp of national unity on mobilizing the voters (registration) and bringing out the vote on election day, something that is absolutely crucial in the present situation.

Finally, in the Kilgore Bill, its so-called human provisions are of tremendous importance — economic importance. These are discussed in the division on retraining and reemployment and are described in previous paragraphs. Here, too, a difficult and fundamental task of reconversion is tackled: to prepare the war workers and veterans for peacetime employment, technically and economically, and to insure for them a minimum of material maintenance in the transition from war work and fighting to peace work. These provisions also extend the social security benefits to new millions now unprovided for. This is, of course, in accord with the social humanities and the dignity of our nation. But this is also good business, good *national* business, for it will maintain and feed the purchasing power of the masses of the people during the transition to civilian jobs, at a time when regular income will be shut off by discontinuance of war production or demobilization from the services. Business will need this continuing flow of purchasing power in order to make

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a good start on *a program of expansion,* and the nation as a whole will need it *to maintain* and then raise the standards of living of our people which is both a task and condition for the continuing national unity, as well as a condition for expanded production and business.

Here again we can see that the varying and conflicting economic interests of the various groups and classes of our nation can be made to meet and become composed and satisfied in the common national task of reconversion to a peace economy—on the basis of private enterprise and by means of a continuing national unity to realize fully the economic possibilities of the Teheran accord, *i.e.,* unprecedented peacetime economic expansion and widespread prosperity.

We have seen that demobilization and reconversion can be carried through successfully *for a new period of economic expansion and prosperity* only with government participation and leadership and with continuing national unity. The same is true for the second basic problem of transition, the problem of foreign trade.

As on the general question of our economic perspectives, so also on the special one of foreign trade, the contribution and leadership of Earl Browder has already met with sincere admiration and appreciation even from opponents of Communism. Said Browder on government and foreign trade:

"The most serious obstacle to the realization of the need of a huge foreign market is the dogma that prohibits the government from exercising any major role in economic affairs. Once it is accepted that the United States government should play as bold a role in securing foreign markets as it is playing in winning a foreign war, then the problem would look entirely different" (*Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace,* page 79).

Why is this so? Why is the role of our government in foreign trade at the present time so absolutely necessary?

First, because the character of foreign trade is undergoing important changes. It is not a question *merely or even largely* of individual private businessmen going out abroad in search of individual customers. This will, of course, take place and in increasing measure, but it is not this that can or will give us the long term, large-scale and expanded foreign trade for the kind of expansion that our economy needs for full employment. To achieve foreign trade on that scale we shall have to undertake the job of helping to develop countries and regions as yet undeveloped or under-developed along with the task of helping to rebuild the war-devastated areas. This great task involves intimately the problem of helping to raise the standard of living of the peoples of those countries and regions. It involves also the problem of assisting those peoples in acquiring and establishing their national freedom and independence. It involves finally the basic problem of economic collaboration in this task with the other United Nations, particularly Great Britain and the Soviet Union. In the realization of these tasks, there will be found tens of billions of dol-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lars of business continuing for many decades. But will anyone seriously contend that these opportunities can be realibed by American business *without* the government participating and leading? Impossible. To deny the leading role of our government in this field is to deny our opportunities and to abandon our country to a future of shrinking business, crisis, poverty and civil chaos.

We repeat: will anyone seriously maintain that this kind of foreign trade can be secured just by the efforts of individual businessmen or corporations going out in the old way to drum up trade? Nonsense.

Second, governments generally will play an increasing part after the war in the economic life of all the United Nations. In some countries it will be more intimate than in others, but it will be crucial in all. The role of the Soviet state in the socialist economy of the U.S.S.R. has already been discussed. What this means for American business should by now be obvious. In large spheres of world economic interchange, dealings will take place *between government and government* representing their respective nations and—for the capitalist countries—representing also the point of view of specially interested businessmen or business groups. Hence, the American government *will have to play* a leading role in foreign trade or else abandon the field of foreign trade—large-scale and long-run—altogether, or go out all by ourselves and try to impose our trade upon the world by sheer force. But for this too we will have government intervention—intervention by the Hoovers, Deweys, etc., for this will mean waging a new war.

Take our economic relations with England. Certainly the future peace of the world and its long-run prosperity will depend a good deal upon our ability to collaborate economically with Great Britain as well as with the Soviet Union. Now, it so happens that the British ruling class is getting ready for an unprecedented amount of government leadership in the economic life of England and the Empire. This is only a necessary and inevitable effort on the part of English capitalism to compensate itself for its various economic weaknesses in relation to American capitalism. Eric Johnston, the head of the American Chamber of Commerce, has already complained about it, but mere complaints will not help, and certainly we are not planning to *force* the British to abandon their plans for larger government intervention in their own economy and in foreign trade.

How serious British business is in this matter—and especially the conservative business circles—may be seen also from a recent article of Geoffrey Crowther, editor of the London *Economist*, in the *New York Times* magazine (August 6, 1944). The article is significant on many points, but the one most relevant to our present discussion is this: within the framework of collaboration between capitalism and socialism, which he advocates, the British ruling class is deliberately moving to a larger economic role by the government in order to strengthen Britain's position in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world markets. This is a fact which we must not ignore or seek to overcome by economic pressure and force, otherwise known as "free enterprise." We must draw the conclusion that such a development in Britain is inevitable and that therefore the best answer is to have our own government—speaking for our people and our business interests—lead American business into the new period and new kind of foreign trade, not to substitute for private enterprise but to work with it and through it, as well as for private enterprise.

As a matter of fact, the Roosevelt administration is already actively engaged in laying the basis for the widest and most profitable expansion of American foreign trade after the war. And is doing it very successfully as can be seen from the initiative taken by our government in the international food conference which will be of great help to our agriculture, in the monetary and credit conference, in the Anglo-American agreements on oil and the current conversations between the two governments on world aviation and shipping after the war, in which the Soviet government is expected to join. Also the economic missions to the Soviet Union and China by Wallace and Nelson. This is the way to prepare for our post-war foreign trade, which means for post-war full employment, for jobs and prosperity.

Naturally, people like J. Howard Pew, the big Philadelphia oil monopolist and angel of Hoover-Dewey leadership, do not like our government's economic policies. Pew even had the audacity to attack the Anglo-American oil agreement as some sinister conspiracy against American business and as "a step toward a super-state cartel in all parts of the world for the post-war years." Naturally again, people like Pew would much rather see a world oil cartel dominated by themselves in combination with similar defeatists and pro-fascists among the oil monopolists of England, Holland and Germany. Hence, Pew does not and cannot like an agreement between democratic governments, responsible to their peoples, to regulate world production and trade in oil. The same is the attitude—naturally—of the Hoover-Dewey leadership of the Republican Party.

But the American people, among them patriotic business and farseeing businessmen, are backing the economic policies of Roosevelt, the policies of preparing for post-war expansion and prosperity on the basis of the Teheran concord, under the leadership and with the active participation of the American government. The American people will subscribe wholeheartedly to the need of government economic intervention and leadership in the post-war years, a need well expressed in the statement of Sidney Hillman for the Political Action Committee of the C.I.O. to the Special Committee of the House on August 28, 1944. It says:

"Our national experience since 1929 has served to teach labor and all Americans that, in this complex modern industrial society of ours, the national well-being is increasingly dependent upon the wise and progressive exercise of the powers of government."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES ON THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE

BY HANS BERGER

SUPPOSE that when Hitler threatened Czechoslovakia in 1938, the United States, the Soviet Union, England and France had jointly sent the following ultimatum to Hitler and Mussolini:

"The Four Powers declare that every aggressive step against Czechoslovakia and every violation of its boundaries will be answered by the common military action of the Four Powers. Appropriate military preparations to this end are being undertaken by the Four Powers jointly with Czechoslovakia. The Four Powers declare further that the occupation of Austria by the Hitler armies must be rescinded within four weeks. Further, the Four Powers will grant the legal Spanish government fullest assistance against the Italian-German invasion. The Four Powers declare simultaneously that they will take all measures necessary against any other nation which supports the German aggressor directly or indirectly."

Mr. Dewey and Mr. Dulles, together with many others of like mind, would naturally have stormed and shed crocodile tears about the "power politics" of the collective security powers and would have sought to confuse such an anti-aggression policy with the hateful policy of predatory imperialism. But what would such a policy of collective security have accomplshed? It is very unlikely that Hitler would have dared to attack and gain many direct or indirect accomplices (as, for example, the then existing Polish government). But even had he dared attack Czechoslovakia under these circumstances, it would not have been possible for him to overrun one country after another in Europe, and to spread frightful misery throughout the world. Such "power politics" by the great democratic powers would have saved the independence of the smaller countries and of so large a power as France. would have reduced the human and material costs of such a war to a minimum, and would have spared the world the full consequences of the catastrophic Munich policy. In the face of such an alliance of the great powers and their joint employment of force against the aggressor in Europe it is also very unlikely that the Japanese would have dared attack us. Finishing off Hitler before he had achieved his temporary great victories, or at least the effective quarantining of Hitler Germany, would have weakened markedly the position of Japanese imperialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japanese imperialism would have been put on the defensive and under such circumstances as could have been utilized for systematically driving it out of China.

Had mankind known at that time the terrible experiences of today, there is no doubt that an overwhelming majority would have supported in the most active way such concerted action by the great democratic powers to forestall world catastrophe.

The reasons that history took another path are well enough known. It is as though history, that terrible taskmaster, had to give mankind a frightful demonstration to prepare it for taking a decisive step forward to guarantee world peace. The representatives of the United States, the Soviet Union and England at the Bumbarton Oaks Conference are preparing the practical proposals for such an international organization of the nations as would guarantee peace after this war is over. Such a conference is possible because of the terrible experiences the nations have endured, because of the existence of the mighty anti-Hitlerite coalition based on friendship and common interests to crush the fascist aggressor and to prevent the repetition of aggression. The fact that this conference is not a public one has nothing to do with the notorious secret diplomacy where plans for new aggressive wars are plotted, where colonies are distributed and other nations sold down the river. The theme being discussed there on the basis of experiences gained is the maintenance of peace. The principles of such a policy are known through the Moscow Conference decisions and the conclusions Teheran, and have been discussed and greeted throughout the whole world. The Teheran declaration said:

"And as to the peace we are sure that our concord will make it an enduring peace. We recognize fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the nations to make a peace which will command good will from the overwhelming masses of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations. With our diplomatic advisers we have surveyed the problems of the future. *We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own people, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance.* We will welcome them as they may choose to come into the world family of democratic nations. . . . Emerging from this friendly conference we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences."

At this conference it is not a question of the sacrifice of the sovereignty of the United States, or of any other country, but rather the solution of the practical questions of cooperation and organization of sovereign nations for the purpose of preventing new wars. When this "committee meeting" of peace-loving and peace-yearning humanity has concluded its deliberations, the governments, the responsible bodies

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the various nations, and the nations will be able to discuss, accept, reject or improve the proposals worked out by the conference.

* * *

As this article is written we do not know the practical results of the conference. It seems to us a waste of time to speculate about possible practical details before these results are available. There is still enough time to deal with them. But the main problems which the conference is working on to guarantee the peace of the world, and which face all nations and especially the great powers, are well known. Basically they revolve around the following questions:

1. Should an international organization be established to guarantee peace?

2. In such an organization, who should have the main responsibility for guaranteeing peace, through utilization of military means?

3. What role should the smaller and weaker nations play in such an organization?

By this time there are relatively few articulate isolationists who dare deny the necessity for such an international organization to guarantee the peace, and the participation of the United States in it. The argument that we can avoid war by steering clear of the "quarrels of other nations" was reft of all power of persuasion after the attack of Japanese imperialism on Pearl Harbor, after the German declaration of war against us. We were not participants in any international organization, we had, unfortunately, no alliances, no cooperation with those forces in the world that wanted to prevent a new world war through the policy of collective security. But despite that, the result was the greatest crisis in our national existence. On the other hand, we have surmounted this crisis successfully and are emerging from this war as victors because we are part of the powerful Anglo-Soviet-American fighting coalition, the leadership and the bulwark of the whole world coalition of the peace-loving nations. There is therefore no doubt that the great majority of our people, like those of the other nations, favors the creation of an international organization and participation of the United States in it.

An international organization of nations is of itself naturally still no guarantee for the maintenance of peace. It can indeed be just the opposite, as was shown by the League of Nations whose policies encouraged the aggressors. It is often asserted that the League of Nations could have assured peace if the United States had been a member. No one can doubt that the absence of the United States contributed to the organic weakness of the League of Nations. But if the United States, as a member, had conducted the same policy that it did toward Manchuria, Spain, and Austria, there would have been no improvement in the work of the League. There would merely have been one more representative in the "Non-Intervention" Commission and in the do-nothing League. If the United States had adopted, within the League of Nations, a chilly and wary policy toward the Soviet

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union, instead of becoming an active champion of, and participant in, the Soviet-sponsored policy of collective security, nothing would have been changed. If every smaller state whose ruling circles supported the policy of the aggressors could sabotage every proposal for collective defense against an aggressor, nothing would have been changed. If the American delegate to the League of Nations had been hampered from making serious proposals for action against the aggressors, from seeking to realize through the power of the League the far-sighted "Quarantine the Aggressor" slogan of President Roosevelt, fascist aggression would not have been blocked. Despite the participation of the United States, the League of Nations would have remained, as it did, in face of the aggressors, a body for postponing decisions, for waiting, for inner maneuvering—in face of aggressors who moved with lightning speed, who attacked nations and who knew extremely well how to exploit the indecisiveness of the League. From this it follows that an international organization can attain its ends only if the very nature of its organization makes it capable of dealing with aggressors, that is, if it is led by states which have both the determination and the might to prevent another war or to check it collectively in the quickest possible manner.

The Anglo-Soviet-American coalition powers must have the leadership of such an organization; they must bear the main responsibility for collective defense against aggressors. There is no other effective collective security. Whoever calls this the "danger of tyranny" by the big powers, as Mr. Dewey does, is either hopelessly stupid or is trying to fish in troubled waters under the pretense of defending the small nations.

Let us assume for a moment that after this war there were not established such an international organization, one in which the great powers bore the main responsibility for guaranteeing peace, and of which they would constitute the core. Would that alter in any way the fact that the United States, the Soviet Union and England are the mightiest powers in the world and have the greatest influence on the fate of other nations and on the course of world events? Why should the danger of "tyranny" arise because the great democratic powers, which became allied in the fight to rid the world of fascism and its aggressions, to liberate the victims of fascist tyrants, remain united for the future maintenance of peace? No, we answer the Deweys, not to organize tyranny over small nations, but in order to prevent it, an international organization must be established in which the great democratic Powers, the U.S.A., the Soviet Union, and Britain, become the chief guarantors for maintaining the peace and the smaller powers contribute to the maintenance of peace to the extent of their abilities. Indeed, Mr. Dewey has thus far not been able to explain why we should suddenly develop tyrannical ambitions if we and the other great powers assume the leadership in such

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an international organization for guaranteeing peace.

But what will become of the smaller and weaker nations? How is their sovereignty to be protected? The answer is simply this: at its best, sovereignty cannot give more than it has. How did the smaller and weaker nations lose their sovereignty? Through "power politics," of course—the power politics of the aggressors, and because the great democratic capitalist states were not prepared to use their might collectively to suport the sovereignty of the smaller and weaker nations. On the contrary, the history of the last years of the League of Nations is the cynical tragedy of the systematic sacrifice of the smaller nations to the aggressors by the governments of England and France at that time, while in the United States, shortsighted people, reactionary isolationists and unreconstructed anti-Sovieteers, inside and outside of Congress, helped to foist upon our nation a policy of passive acquiescence. The smaller and weaker nations were the pawns of the aggressors and of the Munichites. How often in the period between the first and second world wars were the weaker nations used by the great capitalist countries, under the pretense of the sovereignty of small nations, to carry through those reactionary policies which were so fateful for the world. Didn't the Chamberlains encourage the Polish, Roumanian, Yugoslav and Baltic accomplices of Hitler, in order to facilitate Hitler's aggression against the Soviet Union? And how often did the governments of small nations, willingly or unwillingly, permit their countries to be utilized as the agents for reactionary, war-inciting policies! At the time when the Soviet Union was forced to conduct war against the Finnish agents of Hitler, the Argentine representative in the League of Nations declared, for example, that Argentina would withdraw from the League if the Soviet Union were not excluded. And the chairman of the general assembly of the League in which the exclusion of the Soviet Union was carried through, on orders of the Chamberlains and Daladiers, was the president of the Norwegian parliament, Dr. Karl I. Hambro. That was the time when the Munichites attempted to "switch the war," in order to conduct war against the Soviet Union jointly with Hitler. One can cite many reasons to explain the policies of the weaker nations, but it is nonsense to assume, as some liberals do, that justice and freedom have their fountainhead only in small and weak nations.

The weaker nations lost their sovereignty and landed in Hitler's hell because the great democratic capitalist powers were not ready to defend peace jointly with the Soviet Union, but instead misused the smaller nations in order to appease the aggressors, or to carry through their reactionary policies against the Soviet Union. The weaker nations are being rescued from this hell by the collective struggle of the great nations. And only a new international organization led by the great powers which have freed them and which are prepared to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prevent all aggression can guarantee the newly-won sovereignty of the weaker nations in the future.

The Deweys pretend that they are defending the small nations and propose, as the main guarantees of peace, the rights of the small nations as opposed to the duties of the great nations. They do this because they are basically opposed to the development of our friendship with the Soviet Union. They do not want to defend the smaller nations effectively against new aggression together with the Soviet Union and England; rather they want to use the smaller nations, as in the prewar period, as *instruments of their policy against the Soviet Union.* After this war the Deweys want to prosecute that policy which was carried on in the old League of Nations by the English and French plenipotentiaries: "Say it with small nations."

But where would such a policy lead? Exactly to that which the Deweys allegedly want to avoid: once again the utilization of the small nations, the misuse of the small nations in the imperialist chess game, the renewed and systematic organization of international anarchy—with the most terrible consequences, in the first place for the weaker nations, and then for all others.

The sovereignty and the co-responsibility of the smaller and weaker states in a future international organization to guarantee peace would not be violated, but protected, if the great democratic powers, because of their might, would assume the main responsibility for the maintenance of peace. The Czech foreign minister, Dr. Hubert Ripka, the representative of a small nation which was the unfortunate victim of the absence of collective security, formulated this problem exceptionally well in a speech in London on May 18, 1944:

"I should also like to point out that it is a matter of *common sense to realize that the chief concern of any world-wide organization will be the policy assumed by the Great Powers.* If by the very nature of things the Great Powers have a more considerable influence than do the smaller countries, it should be also recognized, as a matter of course, that they can successfully assert their greater influence, only if at the same time they are conscious of the greatest responsibility which devolves upon them. While we recognize the leadership of the Great Powers—Great Britain, the Soviet Union, the United States of America, France and China—we do so on the understanding that it is in accordance with their responsibility, and that it duly takes into account the principle of the equality of all nations, so that no suggestion of dictatorship arises. And again we think it is a matter of common sense to recognize that the world cannot be successfully organized without the active participation and willing cooperation of the smaller and smallest nations." (My emphasis—H.B.)

* * *

A whole collection of cynics has emerged, disguised as students of history, in connection with the discussion of the Dumbarton Oaks

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conference and of the problems of an international organization for guaranteeing peace. They have leafed through their old school books and tell us how in history alliances have arisen and have been dissolved, how the enemy of today became the friend of tomorrow, and the friend of today, the enemy of tomorrow. Such observations, as presented for example by William Hard in the September issue of *Readers Digest*, come to the conclusion, more or less explicitly formulated, that the alliances of this war, and especially with the Soviet Union, are a transitory affair, and that all hope for an organization to guarantee peace by strengthening and developing these friendships and alliances is in vain.

Naturally, in the course of history alliances between nations, classes, sections of the population, have been dissolved and changed, after the immediate purpose of such an alliance has been achieved, or even before. Very often, in such alliances, friends became enemies, and enemies, friends. It is incontestable that this danger exists now, and will continue to exist as long as there are reactionary imperialistic forces that will strive to disunite the nations and imperil world peace. This danger is not an abstract one, but quite real. In all capitalist countries, and not in the least in our own country, powerful and influential circles are attempting to rupture the friendships with other countries established during the war, and especially with the Soviet Union, instead of developing them and anchoring them in an international organization for peace.

If it were up to the Hoovers, Tafts, Deweys, not to speak of the Bullitts, the McCormicks, etc., there would be no doubt as to the direction in which history would lead the changes in international relations.

But the nations and their responsible statesmen will draw other conclusions from history. They reject the "theory" that the alliances of nations which have been created in the struggle for freedom "automatically" must be wiped out when the struggle for freedom has been won. Rather they draw the conclusions, as at Teheran, that these alliances must be so strengthened, and incorporated in such a system of international security, so that it will never again be necessary for the nations to conduct so terrible and costly a war for their freedom.

This question was splendidly clarified by Eugene Dennis in his report, on July 27, to a Mid-West conference of leaders of the Communist Political Association, from which we quote:

"We must make clear that the program of Teheran, including the highly important international peace and security conference which is soon to be held, can only be effective if the alliance of the three leading anti-Hitler states—of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and Great Britain—is maintained and developed.

"That is why we must warn the country and mobilize the people against the dangerous, un-American, anti-Soviet and anti-British

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

schemes and plans for a so-called international peace organization advanced by the Hoovers, the Lippmanns and Tafts which, under the guise of regional blocs and spheres of influence, would try and isolate the Soviet Union from world affairs, would try and organize a new *'cordon sanitaire.'*

"Equally, we must put America on guard against the exponents of a 'supreme United Nations council' which, in the name of democracy, would try and supplant the joint partnership and alliance of the U.S.A., the Soviet Union and Britain with a new system of power politics, with the smaller nations again acting as pawns and puppets of the anti-Sovieteers and the most predatory imperialistic groupings.

"In this connection, we must vividly and convincingly show that the failure of the League of Nations, that the triumph of Munichism, that the outbreak and even the prolongation of this second world war were due primarily to the lack of unity and concerted action of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R and England.

"And, conversely, we must show that the attainment of victory in this war of national liberation and the establishment of a stable peace is and will be the result of the unity, the strength, the friendship and collaboration of the American-Soviet-British coalition and peoples. It will be brought about by a resolute struggle of the peoples and nations to fulfill the program of Teheran and to render enduring the great alliance of the three great anti-Hitler states."

This is the issue which is being resolved in the present elections. It is a question, in the last analysis, of whether the United States wishes to use its great strength, in closest collaboration with its war allies, to guarantee the peace that will have been won with so much blood. What nobler and more effective use can our people make of its sovereignty than voluntarily to help prevent any new war from ravaging and destroying people and their creations?

We should not be deceived because the Deweys and the Dulleses have in recent weeks retreated somewhat, in words, and now declare that they also favor an international organization of peace. It might not be inappropriate to recall that it was Laval who concluded and signed the security pact with the Soviet Union. What happened to that pact under Laval's influence is well known. The Deweys know the sentiments of the voters and therefore make verbal concessions to them. Once they were in power, however, they would play fast and loose with our friendship to the great powers, and especially with the Soviet Union, in the same irresponsible fashion as they do with the most serious internal affairs of our country. The spirit that animates these circles is contradictory to the spirit which is expressed in the words of the Teheran declaration, which inspires the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and which has the confidence and support of the American people and of all freedom- and peace-loving humanity: "We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit and in purpose."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOURCE OF COMMUNIST COURAGE

BY JACQUES DUCLOS

(Secretary of the Communist Party of France)

[*This article appeared in* Cahiers du Communisme, *theoretical organ of the French Communist Party, during the first quarter of 1944. Published and distributed on French territory through underground channels before the invasion of Western Europe and the freeing of Paris by its own inhabitants and the soldiers of the Allies, Jacques Duclos' discussion of the French liberation movement and the role of the French Communists acquires from these recent welcome events a fresh significance of universal scope. It helps to deepen our understanding and appreciation of the heroism, the self-sacrifice, the political steadfastness and the magnificent organization of the French people's anti-fascist forces, in the forefront of which the Communist Party of France brought to the task of liberation pre-eminent contributions of courage, organization, and theoretical clarity.—The Editors.*]

THE struggle for our country's freedom, with all the dangers and sacrifices it requires, enables patriots of varied social and political origin to show their qualities of self-abnegation and courage.

Frenchmen of all walks of life have proved that our precious heritage of heroism lives on among the masses of our people. Some wretches have tried to poison the spirit of the French people with the unholy slogan, "Rather servitude than death." Conscienceless politicians foundered in the Munich policy. But today they can see that the people of France prefer combat to slavery. The people reject the spirit of subservience which the conquerors and the traitors in their service seek to encourage.

Our Party's honor and pride is that it never echoed the campaigns for the moral disarmament of France which the Fifth Column inspired. It always warned our compatriots of the extent of the Hitlerite peril and under all circumstances stressed the need to fight against this danger.

School of Devotion

The French Communist Party, school of courage and devotion to the people's cause, can state that its members have often fought for our country's liberation.

When the war is ended and the invader driven from the sacred soil of our land, a liberated France, in assessing the sacrifices made by the forces of national resistance, will

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

find the contributions of the French Communist Party to be among the most important.

Our Party provided legions of fighters and martyrs. Some names are famous and radiate with glory, others are unknown. But all died with the same triumphant look in their eyes, and in their hearts the same certainty in the final victory of the cause for which they were giving their lives.

Some day the people of France will know the tremendous toll of sacrifices made by all patriots, by thousands upon thousands of Communists whom nothing could bend —neither torture nor promises nor bargaining. Under torturers' blows and at the hangman's gallows they remained silent as the tomb, maintaining above all else their honor as Party members, their love for the Party, organizer of the merciless battle against the Nazi oppressors.

In his last letter, so imbued with greatness and loyalty to the Communist cause, Gabriel Péri expressed magnificently the Communists' *raison d'etre.*

Gabriel Péri, Julien Hapiot

Yes, Gabriel Péri's testament is that of all those Communists who died gloriously on the field of honor; soldiers and officers of the Francs-Tireurs and Partisans, who were shot by the Boches, guillotined by the Vichy traitors, tortured to death by Laval-Pétain police or the Gestapo.

Each one of these men, each of these heroes, before he died could have said with Gabriel Péri:

". . . May my friends know that I remained loyal to the ideal of my life; may my compatriots know that I will die so that France may live.

"I examine my conscience one last time. It is positive. I would follow the same road if I could begin my life anew. I still believe, this night, as my dear friend Paul Vaillant-Couturier said so truly: 'Communism is the world's youth,' and prepares the 'tomorrows that sing.' I feel I have the strength to face death. Farewell. And may France live!"

And these thousands of Communists died thinking about the France they wanted to be free, strong and happy; thinking of their families, their parents, their wife or husband, their children—drawing from this love of dear ones new strength to battle and die bravely, thinking also of their Party.

Before he was shot, Comrade Julien Hapiot wrote: "A few days before my execution, I want once more to express my love for the great Communist Party and my thanks for having taught me and having given me enough knowledge so that I could be useful to my fellow citizens."

And Hapiot added: "Yes, I am proud when I look back, of having followed the path set forth by our glorious Party. And it is this past which the Vichy police torturers and the Gestapo butchers proposed that I betray, as though death were not sweeter than treason. These vile oppressors are not afraid to tell me that the Communists are their main enemies. The tortures to which they subjected me only

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strengthened my conviction that the Communists are the champions of the liberating struggle."

The Communist Party can well be proud of having developed members with such a sense of honor, such a concept of courage, such a spirit of self-sacrifice, such certainty in the future.

The barbarous, ferocious enemy killed us by the thousands. They shot, guillotined or hanged comrades like Gabriel Péri, Pierre Semard, Cadras, Politzer, Solomon, Debarge, Lucien Sampaix, Catelas, Wodli, Dailidet, Picant, Hapiot, Rebiere, Losserand, Carre, Lacazette, Domisse, Hentges, Turban, Michels, Timbaut, Poulmarch, Grandel, Gardette, Granet. And everyone knows that when, before the firing squad at Chateaubriant, Dr. Tenine said to the Boches: "Are you not ashamed to shoot a child?" young Guy Moquet—who was the child concerned—replied to Tenine: "I am as Communist as you." Thus, on the lips of the youthful martyr, the word *Communist* became the synonym of the word *courageous.*

The Party, School of Courage

Why do Communists, all of them, exemplify self-sacrifice and courage? The whole history of our Party answers this question.

From the very start, our Party has been fought bitterly, slandered, vilified by the profiteers and by the apologists for the modern slaveholders, its members dragged in the mud, subjected to the worst provocations. But no persecution could keep it from its work of emancipating mankind. And if persecutions could not and cannot succeed in breaking our Party, but only succeed in spilling the pure and generous blood of Communist fighters, it is *because our Party is correct,* because its path is the path of the development of human society, because the aim it has set itself is inscribed in actuality.

The truth is, as Friedrich Engels wrote:

"The possibility of securing for every member of society, by means of socialized production, an existence not only fully sufficient materially, and becoming day by day more full, but an existence guaranteeing to all the free development and exercise of their physical and mental faculties—this possibility is now for the first time here, but it is here." (Engels, *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific,* International Publishers, New York, 1935, p. 72.)

The Communists Are Right

The Communists are right to fight against modern slavery, of which fascism is the most hideous and hateful expression, just as the first Christians *were right* when they opposed their doctrine of human brotherhood to ancient slavery. They were persecuted as are the Communists today, but nothing could save ancient slavery any more than anything can save modern slavery.

Persecutions could never stop the expansion of an idea once it has become a material force by taking hold of the masses. Friedrich Engels wrote in this regard the following conclusion to his Introduc-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of 1895 to Karl Marx's *Class Struggles in France (1848-1850):*

"It is now, almost to the year, sixteen hundred years since a dangerous party of revolt made a great commotion in the Roman Empire. It undermined religion and all the foundations of the state; it flatly denied that Caesar's will was the supreme law; it was without a fatherland, international; it spread over all countries of the Empire, from Gaul to Asia, and beyond the frontiers of the Empire. It had long carried on an underground agitation in secret; for a considerable time, however, it had felt itself strong enough to come out into the open. This party of revolt, who were known by the name of Christians, was also strongly represented in the army; whole legions were Christians. When they were ordered to attend the sacrificial ceremonies of the pagan established church, in order to do the honors there, the soldier rebels had the audacity to stick peculiar emblems—crosses—on their helmets in protest. Even the wonted barrack cruelties of their superior officers were fruitless. The Emperor Diocletian could no longer quietly look on while order, obedience and discipline in his army were being undermined. He intervened energetically, while there was still time. He passed an anti-Socialist, I should say anti-Christian, law. The meetings of the rebels were forbidden, their meeting halls were closed or even pulled down, the Christian badges, crosses, etc., were . . . prohibited. Christians were declared incapable of holding office in the state, they were not to be allowed even to become corporals. . . .

"This exceptional law was also without effect. The Christians tore it down from the walls with scorn; they are even supposed to have burnt the Emperor's palace in Nicomedia over his head. Then the latter revenged himself by the great persecution of Christians in the year 303, according to our chronology. It was the last of its kind. And it was so effective that seventeen years later the army consisted overwhelmingly of Christians, and the succeeding autocrat of the whole Roman Empire, Constantine, called the Great by the priests, proclaimed Christianity as the state religion."

Honesty, Action, Friendly Emulation

More than any other group in the modern world, the Communists have had concentrated upon them the hatred of the slaveholders. And in his beautiful book, *Stalin,* our belived Henri Barbusse could say: "Communism brought forth upon the universe a multitude of apostles taxing the imagination. . . . Upon the entire surface of the earth, the Communists have spilt in profusion the beautiful red of their blood."

If certain people thought they would get good jobs, advantages, well-cushioned electoral posts, sinecures of all sorts, by entering the Party, they found out soon enough that they had taken a wrong turn and went their own ways. It is well to remember that Party deputies only drew a part of their salaries, equivalent to a skilled worker's pay. The rest went into the Party treasury for propaganda work; for the Party watched over its members elected to government posts so that they would not permit

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves to become enfeebled by the delicate atmosphere in the Palais Bourbon and would never forget the people's struggle and sorrows.

Our Party grew up in struggle against the political horse-traders, professional politicians, traffickers in public posts. What some have considered the expression of an excessive rigorousness, was an imperative necessity without which there would not have been a Communist Party able to face the most difficult situations. There would have been instead a party like so many others which the storm would have scattered like so many dead leaves.

An infamous politician who was the first general secretary of our Party, but who, for a long time, has become the devoted servant of the trusts and an agent of France's enemies—L. O. Frossard—could write recently, "We must not judge the Communists on our own common scale." By this he admitted that those who reduce the motives of human activity to personal interests and "each for himself" can neither understand nor judge the Communists.

Agreement Between Words and Actions

It is our Party's honor to have developed men before whom one must bow, whose self-sacrifice and courage must be recognized. The men who took their place in the ranks of our Party, whether they be workers, peasants or intellectuals, have lived and live in an atmosphere of political honesty, courage, action and friendly emulation which has marked them with its imprint.

In various political parties, obvious differences are discernible between words and actions. This contradiction, to which politicians have grown accustomed, has never been tolerated in our Party.

When, for example, Hitler-Germany and fascist Italy attacked the Spanish Republic, many Frenchmen understood that this was the prelude to fascist aggression against the other countries of Europe. But our Party alone courageously drew the practical conclusions flowing from this realization.

Our Party, which was alone in voting against the Laval-Mussolini agreements in 1935, conducted a bitter campaign against the so-called policy of "non-intervention" which played Hitler's and Mussolini's game, and worked to secure aid to the Spanish Republican government. Our comrade, André Marty, organized the International Brigades which covered themselves with glory in the battle against fascism. It is understandable that Hitler and his agents have not forgiven André Marty for this, and hurl insults at him at every opportunity. But it is an honor for the Communists to be designated as targets by the fascists and their valets.

Certainly, in 1938, some elected representatives were to be seen in the corridors of the Chamber and Senate who, in private conversations, professed to be against the Munich policy. But nonetheless they voted for this diplomatic action which was prepared and desired by the Hitlerite Fifth Column

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under the leadership of Georges Bonnet and his associates. But our Party lined up against the Munich pact without fear of being alone, because the interests of the people, of France, of the anti-fascist struggle came first, and no risk, no danger could stop the Party from carrying out its duty. There was agreement between the words and deeds of the Communist Party which was not in the least torn between "cowardly solace and shame."

During the Period of the Phony War

Convinced that fascism constituted an imminent danger to France, and that all Frenchmen who were determined not to let our country be prey to the swastika-ed barbarians must be united, our Party, through Maurice Thorez, its general secretary, proposed from 1938 on, that a French national front be formed. But that proposal came up against the hostility of men who talked unity but whose actions did not agree with their words.

This political dishonesty, based on contradiction between deeds and words, did much harm to France. Our people want to rid themselves of it forever. When in September, 1939, the French government declared war on Hitler, this was but pretense; in truth they did not want to war on Hitler; they hoped they would not have to fight him; they stayed behind the Maginot Line; they backed Finland against the Soviet Union. And Hitler must have laughed to see his "enemies" defend his very own points of attack against the U.S.S.R. They mobilized a sizable army in Syria and it was destined to fight not Hitler, but the Soviet Union with which they did not want honestly to form an alliance capable of fighting Hitler.

Our Party was neither dupe nor accomplice in those odious proceedings. It denounced the comedy of "warring" against Hitler while preparing to surrender France. It did not let itself be stopped by the repression demanded fanatically by those who were to surrender France to the enemy and stop the French people from waging a war for liberty and winning new Valmy victories, as in 1792.

And during this period, aside from a handful of traitors who withdrew of their own accord from the great Communist family and went over to the service of the Hitlerites, our members resisted all pressure on them, all threats of death hurled at them by those who simultaneously were permitting full freedom of action to the traitors de Brinon, Laval, Deat, Bergery, and so many others. The bulk of our members, despite persecution, remained faithful to Communism and thus to our land.

The Development of Personality

Enemies of the Party, and also some well-intentioned people who are badly informed, try to explain this loyalty of the Communists to their Party, to their teachings, to their leaders in terms of a sort of destruction of all personality, a blind obedience. Nothing is more false, nothing more contrary to the Party's principles and practice.

There is no group of human be-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ings in which there is so much demand for individual initiative as in the Communist Party. In no group of people does the individual have greater opportunity to develop his personality than in the Communist Party. For our Party, founded on a scientific base, is not a party merely of followers, it is not a party of empty, sterile discussions detached from life and from the tasks of the hour. It is the Party whose doctrine is deepened and enriched in contact with life and in action.

We know some great intellectuals, honor and pride of our Party, who acknowledge that in Marxist-Leninist doctrine they have found profound elements of knowledge for certain aspects of their scientific work. Thanks to this doctrine, workers have become marvelous leaders of men, capable, alone in the midst of difficulties, of finding the road to follow to defend the people's interests.

The Strength of Marxist-Leninist Theory

"The power of Marxist-Leninist theory lies in the fact that it enables the Party to find the right orientation in any situation, to understand the inner connection of current events, to foresee their course and to perceive not only how and in what direction they are developing in the present, but how and in what direction they are bound to develop in the future. . . .

"It may seem that all that is required for mastering the Marxist-Leninist theory is diligently to learn by heart isolated conclusions and propositions from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, learn to quote them at opportune times and rest at that, in the hope that the conclusions and propositions thus memorized will suit each and every situation and occasion. But such an approach to the Marxist-Leninist theory is altogether wrong. The Marxist-Leninist theory must not be regarded as a collection of dogmas, as a catechism, as a symbol of faith, and the Marxists themselves as pedants and dogmatists. The Marxist-Leninist theory is the science of the development of society, the science of the working-class movement, the science of the proletarian revolution, the science of the building of the Communist society. And as a science it does not and cannot stand still, but develops and perfects itself. Clearly, in its development it is bound to become enriched by new experience and new knowledge, and some of its propositions and conclusions are bound to change in the course of time, are bound to be replaced by new conclusions and propositions corresponding to the new historical conditions. . . .

"The Marxist-Leninist theory is not a dogma but a guide to action." (*History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, International Publishers, New York, 1939, p. 355, 356.)

A guide to action—that is what our theory really is, and a Party which demands that its members know how to undertake their responsibilities in the development and carrying out of action, must make of its members not robots but men full of initiative, men conscious of the many-sided nature of the struggle, men who understand that it is better to make mistakes while doing, than "not to be wrong" while

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

passively looking on at the unfolding of events.

The Sense of Responsibility

A sense of responsibility—this is what characterizes the Communists. This is the primary quality which the Party tries to develop to the maximum among its members, in all parts of its organization, so that each leader, if required by circumstances, can in a given situation, work on his own to take that action which corresponds to the people's interests.

The Reichstag incendiaries and the Vichy traitors who make use of Creyssel to manufacture false anti-Communists, also make use of Henriot to try to slander our Party. This wretch goes about repeating that the Communist Parliamentary group upon several occasions demanded that the Chamber's meetings be suspended, supposedly to ask orders from Moscow. Nothing could be more blatantly untrue. Under all circumstances, the Party has made its own decisions, and if recesses were demanded at certain times, it was by those parties that were suffering internal disruption, which was often caused by penetration of outside influences, financial and otherwise. But in our Party such influences cannot be felt, for no sign of venality or dependence is tolerated among Party members.

Materialist theory, Marx said, cannot limit itself to explaining the world, the task is to change it. And it is in full recogntion of its historic tasks that our Party opposes the theory of spontaneity, which is the idea of the lessening of the role of the conscious element in the movement; the ideology of tail-endism which is the logical basis of all opportunism.

The Sense of Self-Criticism

The Communist individual, who has a sense of responsibility, also has a sense of self-criticism; he does not let himself be stopped by prejudices, by a sort of false vanity. He knows that self-criticism is a weapon in his hands, a weapon to discover errors made and to correct them so as to move forward.

"The attitude of a political party toward its own mistakes, is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it in practice fulfills its obligations toward its *class* and the toiling *masses*. Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analyzing the conditions which led to it, and thoroughly discussing the means of correcting it—that is the earmark of a serious party; that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the *class*, and then the *masses*." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. XXV, p. 200. Cited in *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 361.)

Thus, the Communists are not eternal repeaters of texts, they do not simply note events, they do all that they can to influence them. They do not only denounce the hated Nazi domination, they fight the Nazis by all possible means, they join the Franc-Tireurs and the Partisans, they demand arms, they lead by example in battle without quarter against the assassins, they

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

denounce the self-styled élite who shun action today and reserve themselves for tomorrow. They have confidence in the people and do not fear the truth.

The Communists courageously told the people the truth in 1936 when Maurice Thorez, not letting himself be troubled by the demagogy of certain double-dealing amateurs, declared in the name of the Central Committee: "Everything is not possible; we must know how to end a strike."

The Communists told the people the truth in spite of the campaign waged by the Nazi terrorists and the Vichyites against the so-called "terrorism," when they showed the necessity of armed struggle against the invader.

Our Aim: To Liberate Our Land

And today everyone can realize that it is thanks to this armed patriots' struggle that Corsica has been liberated.

The people of France understand from now on the necessity of armed struggle to free our land, and the French Committee of National Liberation's Commissioner of the Interior, Emanuel d'Astier de la Vigerie, showed the importance of this struggle which must grow ceaselessly, when he said:

"No day passes but there are five, six, eight attacks on railroad lines, often very spectacular operations, and amazing escapes. This minor war is, nevertheless, slow and feeble, for Frenchmen have no arms. We must shout loudly: Frenchmen lack arms. It is incredible to record the indifference of the great powers in this regard. This resistance could play a major role in the Allied war effort if it were equipped with the necessary means. The Franc-Tireurs, partisans, patriots would receive with joy these arms which they await so impatiently. The war would be shortened considerably. That would mean human lives spared, English, American soldiers spared.

"On the other side of the Mediterranean a whole nation is on its feet, clenching its fists, waiting for guns, for machine-guns and grenades, so that they may fight and thus hasten the hour of victory."

Our Party, whose aim is to liberate our land and to permit the French people to select a government of their own choice, is not waiting on the balcony of history for outside help to save our country. Our Party knows how much the Red Army is contributing to hasten the hour of our country's liberation, it knows that if the Second Front had already been established, the war would already be over. But it knows that if France wants to maintain its position as a great nation tomorrow, Frenchmen must fight. That is why the Communists are not thinking, as some do, in terms of designating high officials for tomorrow. They believe that service stripes must be won in battle and they consider that the duty of all Frenchmen is to fight, which means to translate their patriotic theories into action.

Indeed, the joint repression of the Boche and the Vichy traitors has already taken many victims, but patriots worthy of the name do not let themselves be stopped

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the fury of the modern Huns whose tortures recall the darkest periods of the Middle Ages. Our Party, which denounces the traitors, the informers, is proud of its members who, when they have fallen into the hands of the enemy, say nothing—not one word which can be used by the enemy, putting above all else their honor as Communists, their honor as soldiers of liberation.

Democracy and Discipline

Some of our fellow-workers in the resistance movement raise questions concerning our Party's leadership. The present leadership was elected at the last Party convention at Arles in December, 1938. The Central Committee, except for certain traitors who can be counted on the fingers of one hand, is at its fighting post. Several of its members —Semard, Péri, Catelas, Wodli, Cadras—were shot, hanged by the Boches or guillotined by Pucheu. But the Central Committee, inside France itself, leads the struggle waged by French Communists. Its discipline has won the respect of all, because it is all the more firm for being freely agreed to, because it expresses the complete unity of will and action of all Party members.

In the period of legality, broad democracy was the rule in the Party. Each member had the right to express his opinion on any particular question at his club meeting, at the section or regional conference, or at the national Party convention. But once the discussions were ended, once the majority had agreed, there remained but a single law for all Communists—to carry out the Party's decisions. The unity of will and action of all members is the indispensable condition without which one can imagine neither a united Party nor the possibility of maintaining an iron discipline in the Party.

But in the present period of underground activity, "The Communist Party can only fulfill its duty if it is organized in the most centralized manner, if it is ruled by an iron discipline closely resembling military discipline, and if the Party's leading body enjoys high authority, is entrusted with extended powers and benefits from the general confidence of Party members." (Lenin)

All Communists are conscious of the need for this discipline, thanks to which our Party can strike very hard blows at the enemy and play an enormous role in the French resistance movement.

And each day additional patriots come to ask to join the ranks of our great Party, for they are inspired by the solidity of our organization, the clearness of its theory, its high moral position, the human worth and courage of its members.

Build the Party for France's Liberation

These new Communists would be even more numerous if our organizations would resolutely undertake a recruiting campaign, and in this regard let us recall what is said in "Build the Party for France's Liberation":

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"All Frenchmen who wish to fight from now on to liberate our land, to assure for tomorrow her liberty, independence and greatness, have a place for them in the French Communist Party.

"To join the French Communist Party means for a Frenchman to take a pledge before his homeland that he will battle the invaders and the traitors by all methods, it is a pledge to work to achieve the unity of all Frenchmen for battle and for victory, it is a pledge to stand firm against the policy of waiting to be saved from outside, against any lack of faith in our people's destiny, it means working to heighten the morale of Frenchmen to confront reality, it is a pledge not to draw back from any sacrifice needed to bring the liberating battle to final victory, adopting as his own the watchword of Saint-Juste: 'Circumstances are difficult only for those who recoil before the tomb.'"

And let us add that there is a place in our ranks for all those men of good will who have not yet assimilated our Party's theory, but who honestly apply its directives. The appeal says specifically that the Party:

". . . opens its ranks to all men and women even if they do not share its philosophic concepts, on condition that they respect Party discipline and scrupulously apply its decisions, not trying to propagandize within the Party for philosophic concepts other than those the Party holds."

It is thus that Christians are joining the Party, as well as former members of the Socialist Party, the Radical Party, the P.S.F., and of divers other groups. We greet all these new comrades who have come to swell the ranks of our great Communist family to work today for the liberation of France and tomorrow for her rebuilding, with the spirit of self-sacrifice and resolve which characterize a Communist.

To work to unite all Frenchmen for the national insurrection which will liberate France without being stopped by any interest contrary to that of our homeland; to work to enlarge France's place in the war so that tomorrow she may regain her liberty, independence and greatness; to work to prepare our country's rebirth—these are the great objectives which light the life of the Communist, whose greatest ambition is to excel in the liberating struggles and whose greatest ideal is to contribute by his labor, his sufferings and if need be, his blood, toward the forward march to humanity's emancipation, to the conquest of happiness.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LESSON OF THE QUEBEC ELECTION

BY STANLEY B. RYERSON

THE electoral victory of Duplessis' Union Nationale on August 8 in Quebec drives home with renewed and brutal emphasis the lesson of Ontario's election a year before: the compelling urgency of the need for unity of the forces of labor and democracy.

The policy of *democratic coalition,* advanced and fought for by the Labor Progressives, has once more been vindicated—at bitter cost. If the labor movement in Canada should fail to learn in time the lesson of this experience, the defeats in Ontario and Quebec will be followed by a new and worse defeat on a federal scale.

The forces represented by Duplessis and by Drew are those most hostile to national unity, to social reform, and to world-democratic unity. Duplessis' anti-Communism and Drew's Empire exclusivism are equally inimical to the Anglo-Soviet American coalition. On the part of both, "provincial rights" serve at once to divide the nation and obstruct the enactment of measures of social security. They are the spokesmen of pro-fascist Toryism.

That both are in relatively weak parliamentary positions gives ground for looking to a speedy rallying of the democratic opposition; but their occupancy of the seats of government in the two key provinces of the Dominion is a continuous threat to Canadian unity and security, which must be faced in all its implications for the future.

How was it possible for Duplessis to regain power in Quebec?

The forces of progress in French Canada had begun to make great headway, securing social and economic gains of historic importance. The reform program initiated by Premier Godbout reflected the growth of the trade unions, and the progressive awakening among the people generally. Yet the forces of reaction have gained the upper hand—thanks to disunity in the democratic camp.

The chief onus of responsibility for this disunity rests with the policy of the Canadian Commonwealth Federation leadership.

Labor in Quebec faced its greatest opportunity—it had the chance to intervene in the political struggle on behalf of its own interests and those of the nation, and to help decisively in blocking a reactionary bid for power. Organized labor, close to 200,000 strong, was in a position to ensure the defeat of Duplessis. But the whole weight of the growing C.C.F. influence was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thrown in the scales *against* the policy of democratic unity. "Defeat the Liberals at all costs!"—this slogan, which sums up the whole line of the C.C.F. in the election, meant and could only mean, "Help Duplessis and the Bloc."

Within the trade union movement, the C.C.F. worked hand-in-glove with the Duplessis agent, Paul Fournier, to prevent any effective unfolding of activity by the recently established Committee for Political Action. Only at the eleventh hour was it possible for a number of the local Committees to act on their own; and in so doing they actively helped to defeat Duplessis candidates in a number of the Montreal constituencies.

It is no accident that the outspoken pro-fascist, Henri Bourassa, gave the C.C.F. the benediction of the Bloc Populaire, as the "next best" party, or that the fascist Sauriol in Maisonneuve, notorious for his denunciation of the United Nations and his calls for civil war in Quebec, should have publicly offered the C.C.F. the use of halls rented by himself, but refused to them by the Catholic School Commission.

The line of disruption of anti-fascist national unity had been clearly advanced by Frank Scott in his report to the Quebec C.C.F. Convention in May. It was followed through consistently in the electoral struggle, to its full, poisonous fruition.

The C.C.F., despite the defeat of all its candidates but one (D. Cote, elected as the miners' union candidate in Noranda, with Labor Progressive Party support), has nonetheless emerged in this election as a factor in Quebec. The 35,000 voters who gave it support are in the main workers and small middle-class folk, anxious for change, desirous of reform. They are part of the labor and people's movement. It is all the more urgent, then, that this force should be brought onto the constructive path of democratic national unity.

The essential pre-condition now for the successful defense of labor's rights and civil liberty in Quebec, as for the advance to post-war security and strengthened Canadian unity, is the effective establishment of a *democratic coalition.*

The two main components of such a coalition are the reform Liberals and the labor movement. Acting in unison, fighting boldly on every one of the issues of trade union rights, social security, and national unity that will face the province, they can win the support of a powerful movement of the democratic majority in Quebec.

This means, in practice, continued strengthening of the trend which asserted itself in the Liberal camp only on the eve of the election; a trend toward a *positive* approach to the problems of winning the war and of democratic post-war reconstruction—and away from policies of spineless appeasement of pro-fascist, anti-war elements. (Demagogic attempts to outdo the isolationists at their own game served only to weaken profoundly the Liberals' position.) It means the full acceptance of a fighting partnership with labor, readiness to participate

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the struggle for labor's rights, refusal to succumb to Red-baiting. This was the attitude displayed by the Liberals in the last phase of the campaign; carried forward now, strengthened and extended, it can lead to both a regrouping of forces in the provincial field, and the laying of a basis for a democratic victory in the coming federal election.

* * *

If the need for a policy of *democratic coalition* stands out, crystal clear, as the lesson of the election in French Canada, it is important likewise to take into full account the role of the *national factor* in the fight for Canadian unity. There is food for thought in the fact that while Drew is seeking to whip up a storm of anti-French Canadian chauvinism in Ontario, Duplessis has won power by exploiting the national sentiment of the French Canadian people of Quebec.

The Mobilization Act as "conscriptionist oppression"; war-time restrictions and centralization as "denial of Quebec's rights, negation of Quebec's autonomy"—this theme was dominant in the campaigns of the Union Nationale and the Bloc Populaire alike.

Duplessis' organ, *Le Temps*, combined vicious caricatures attacking the war effort ("Godbout's war!") with brazen outbursts of anti-Semitism that matched anything of Arcand's in the past. The Bloc dramatized the accidental police shooting of a deserter, Guenet, as the "assassination of a national hero" and circulated lurid photographs of the scene where the death occurred.

Cynical exploitation of anti-conscriptionist sentiment, demogagic appeals to national feeling, an attempt to recapture the "No" vote of the Plebiscite in the interests of national disruption—such was the content of reaction's campaign, and those who fell victim to it were not only large numbers of women, voting for the first time in a provincial election, and farm folk in the outlying areas—but thousands of urban industrial workers also.

Under no circumstances can the labor movement afford to underestimate the scope and import of the factor of national division and prejudice. The pro-fascist circles of English-Canadian big business who poured money like water into Duplessis' campaign fund evidently understood its usefulness to them. Their aims will be blocked by the camp of national unity only if and when the labor and democratic forces give bold and energetic leadership to the solving of national grievances in French Canada.

The trade unions have begun to tackle successfully the job of winning for Quebec wage equality with Ontario. The Liberal reform program of Godbout placed in the forefront the issue of eliminating the economic and social inequalities that beset French Canada. These first beginnings are tremendously welcome signs—but still, are just beginnings.

It can be stated categorically that until the whole issue of national inequality is grappled with, seriously and decisively, by the united

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

efforts of labor, business, and the whole democratic camp, there will be no full achievement of national unity in Canada, and reaction will continue to win new successes.

Post-war reconstruction in Canada can only be effective if it is based squarely on a real national unity; and *national unity* cannot be maintained without *full national equality.*

This issue, now more than ever before, must be tackled by the whole labor movement; and the measure of labor's statesmanship will be directly reflected in the degree to which it wages a fight for the solution of French Canadian grievances.

Labor has demonstrated in Quebec that where a correct national unity policy is followed, cooperation of all classes can effect great reforms. National grievances in French Canada *can* be met and overcome. The carrying forward of the social and economic reforms started by Premier Godbout, and the consolidation of labor's gains in Quebec, are essential to Canada's post-war prosperity and security. Only the concerted, unified effort of the national unity camp in the whole of Canada can achieve these aims and sweep aside the opposition of the Duplessis-Drew minority cabal.

Unity or Chaos—the stern alternative made clear in Tim Buck's call for national unity is now inescapably, unmistakably, the issue facing all Canadians. In placing this issue in its true light, and fighting for the democratic national unity coalition of the Canadian majority, lies the major contribution of the Labor-Progressive Party to the battle for our country's future.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FIVE YEARS OF WAR IN EUROPE*

FIVE years ago the criminal hand of the German aggressor lit the fires of war in Europe, which soon enveloped practically the whole world. The situation on this anniversary of the war's outbreak is that the black forces of predatory German imperialism are nearer to defeat than ever before.

Lately the tempo of the war has increased immensely. Now not only from two fronts, but from many directions, the victorious armies of the freedom-loving nations are nearing the lair of the fascist beast. The edifice erected by the piratical, aggressive bloc on the promise of rapid victory and easy spoils is definitely collapsing. The dawn of liberation has risen over the occupied countries of Europe, and their tormented but uncowed peoples are rising with ever-increasing determination to fight the German invaders.

The enemy is still offering desperate resistance; many difficult and bloody battles are still to be fought. But it is already clear that the complete defeat of Hitler Germany is a matter of the near future.

When they launched into their bloody adventure, Hitler and his gang counted on a blitzkreig. Their bandit imaginations conjured up illusive prospects of the subjugation of Europe and then of the whole world by means of short, rapid blows at the disunited adversaries. These fantastic plans were based upon the Germans' defective political and military strategy, with its penchant for vaingloriously overrating their own strength and arrogantly underrating the strength of their opponent.

In the Soviet Union, Hitler's blitzkrieg machine first encountered an insuperable wall of resistance built by the self-sacrifice and determination of the Soviet people and the valor and heroism of the Red Army. In the fire of struggle against the mortal enemy of the peace-loving peoples was forged and tempered the anti-Hitler coalition headed by the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States, whose united strength foreshadowed the death sentence to Hitler tyranny.

However, much time was needed by the foes of piratical Germany, not only to bring about the collapse of the Germans' plans for world domination, but also to bring the enemy to the brink of disaster. Such was the heavy price of the grim and protracted struggle, involving unparalleled sacrifices and privations, which the freedom-loving nations had to pay for the fatal blunders of the pre-war period, when the narrow and shortsighted

* Translation of an editorial from the Soviet journal, *War and the Working Class*, No. 17.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy of the leaders of the Western powers fostered and nurtured the German aggressor and then prevented the forces of peace from uniting to avert his piratical enterprise.

After their blitzkreig plans had failed, the Nazi bandits banked upon protracting the war. They declared they were prepared to fight for 30 years if necessary, their idea being to sow dissension in the camp of the anti-Hitler powers and to exploit the growing war fatigue in order to attain a compromise peace which would afford Germany respite in which to prepare for a new and bloodier act of aggression.

These calculations of the German fascist bandits were also foiled, thanks to the determination of the freedom-loving nations effectively to eradicate the Nazi scourge and not to allow it to persist or to be revived in any shape or form.

Five years of war have entailed the severest trials and sacrifices for the freedom-loving nations. The awful typhoon of war has wrecked millions of lives and colossal material values. The Nazi miscreants condemned to inhuman suffering and frightful death millions of peaceful civilians, women, children and old folk. In their savage fury of destruction the German vandals destroyed the fruits of the labor of many generations, have delivered to fire and destruction priceless monuments of culture, and reduced flourishing countries to desert zones.

The peoples who sustained the full weight of the struggle against Hitler aggression have stood with credit, trials without precedent or parallel. And now, when the end is already near, they are deeply concerned that when the enemy has been vanquished this war shall be crowned by a stable and durable peace.

Of all the fruits of the long-expected victory, the most longed-for is a stable peace and security in the relations between nations. This fruit will not fall ripe from the tree. There are many difficulties and obstacles in the way of its attainment. But these obstacles must be surmounted, for the peace-loving nations which have lived through the trials of this war do not want to return to the state of permanent alarm and instability in which, as on a volcano, Europe and the whole world lived during the two decades which separated the First and Second World Wars.

In the course of the present war a coalition of mighty powers arose to fight German imperialism and its predatory partners. A basis was found which made it possible to plan and carry out, within the framework of coalition war, joint actions on a gigantic scale. What furnished the basis for the cooperation of the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain was the identity underlying the vital interests of these powers, to which Germany's bid for world domination spelled mortal danger.

The task is to create, when the war is over, a no less solid union of peace-loving states for the protection of the world from fresh attempts on the part of German imperialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All true supporters of peace are anxious to find a reliable foundation for such post-war cooperation between the Soviet Union, Great Britain, the United States and all other peace-loving countries. We know that the German imperialists are basing their schemes for revenge after their inevitable defeat in this war on the difficulties involved in creating such a foundation for such post-war cooperation.

The German imperialists hope that the freedom-loving powers will fail to find a new basis for cooperation after the war, with the result that Germany will be in a position to prepare for a new and even more frightful war. This hope of the German bandits must be foiled at all costs. The result of the war must be to cement the post-war union of peace-loving states, big and small, and at the same time to create maximum hindrances to the revival of the aggressive forces. A solid basis for post-war cooperation must be created in the interests of peace between the nations for the longest possible period.

On the threshold of the sixth year of the war in Europe, the Soviet people are firmly confident not only of victory, which is now undoubtedly near, but also of the full possibility of insuring a stable peace and world security. No little remains to be done to convert this possibility into reality, but the people of the Soviet Union, a power which has always been a consistent champion of peaceful and friendly relations between peoples and of preventing all aggressive attempts forcibly to re-divide the world, firmly hope that this grand and noble task will be successfully accomplished as a result of the concerted efforts of all true champions of international security.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ARMISTICE AGREEMENT WITH ROUMANIA*

AS A result of negotiations in Moscow, an Armistice Agreement with Roumania was signed on September 12. The Roumanian Government and High Command accepted the armistice terms presented by the Governments of the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States. Today we publish the text of this Agreement, a document of major international political significance.

The armistice terms were preliminarily discussed by the Allies with great care and full agreement was reached on their definitions. The Agreement was signed by Marshal of the Soviet Union Rodion Y. Malinovsky on behalf of the three Allied powers, who acted in the interests of all the United Nations for the furtherance of the success of their common struggle against Germany and her satellites.

The Armistice Agreement with Roumania is the result of the outstanding victories of the Red Army.

The Agreement begins by stating that Roumania acknowledgtes her defeat in the war against the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, the United States and the other United Nations. The defeat sustained by Roumania on the battlefield was inflicted by Soviet arms. Many Roumanian divisions were shattered at Odessa, Stalingrad and in the Crimea, and the Red Army scored brilliant victories over Roumanian and German forces on the territory of Roumania herself.

The character and scale of this victory may be judged by the report published yesterday by the Soviet Information Bureau on the results of the Jassy-Kishinev operation. In this, one of the biggest and from a strategical and military-political standpoint most outstanding operations in the present war, 15 German divisions, not counting Roumanian troops, were surrounded and annihilated.

The Jassy-Kishinev operation crowned a series of telling blows which brought Roumania to defeat. The Red Army's victory on the Roumanian *place d'armes* signified a major success for the common cause of the Allies, hastened the disintegration of the fascist bloc and is expediting the hour of complete defeat of all Germany's forces.

Roumania has not only withdrawn from the war against the United Nations, but has turned her arms against Germany and her Hungarian vassal. Roumania has joined the war against Germany and Hungary, with the purpose of recovering her independence and sovereignty, and will fight on the side of the Allied powers.

* Translated from an editorial in *Izvestia*, Sept. 14.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The armistice terms presented to Roumania were based upon two considerations: first, Roumania's military defeat, and second, the fact that Roumania will henceforward take part in the war on the side of the Allied powers.

The Soviet people with the strength of their arms saved their sacred land and ejected from its borders the troops of the Roumanian invader. Article 4 of the Armistice Agreement reads: "The State boundaries between the U.S.S.R. and Roumania established by the Soviet-Roumanian Agreement of June 28, 1940, are restored. This Article is a stake in the grave of the insensate adventure of the Roumanian imperialists who cherished the dream of seizing Soviet territory, of a 'Roumanian Odessa' of a 'Roumanian Transdnistria,' of Roumanian villas on the Crimean coast."

Soviet frontier posts are again occupying their lawful place on the banks of the Prut and the Danube. The frontiers of the U.S.S.R. are now and henceforward inviolable.

The Roumanian invaders caused severe damage to our country and wrecked many cities, villages and farms. The Soviet people cannot forget that. Roumania bears responsibility for the damage done to Soviet land. Under the terms of the Armistice Agreement, Roumania undertakes to restore all valuables and materials carried away from the territory of the U.S.S.R.

The thousands of Soviet citizens, war prisoners and civilians, interned or forcibly carried off to Roumania will be liberated and restored to their homeland.

Furthermore, Roumania has undertaken to compensate for the losses caused the Soviet Union by military actions and by the occupation of Soviet territory by Roumanian troops. In defining the amount of reparations for losses caused, account was taken of the fact that Roumania has not only withdrawn from the war against the United Nations, but is also now fighting on the side of the Allied powers against Germany and Hungary. The clearly-expressed desire of Roumania to act in the interests of the Allies, and the military obligations she has assumed, had their influence.

Roumania is displaying the desire to atone for the ill she has done humanity and to obliterate from the memory of nations the deplorable page in her recent past, with which she has now resolutely broken.

The Allies no doubt also took into account Roumania's dire economic condition, resulting from the ravages of Hitler Germany. The Soviet Union has displayed its characteristic magnanimity with regard to Roumania, who having received a cruel lesson was wise enough, although belatedly, to draw a saving conclusion from it.

The U.S.S.R. consented to Roumania's making, not full, but partial reparation. Roumania is to pay to the Soviet Union $300,000,000 in goods over a period of six years.

The armistice terms also provide for compensation for losses inflicted upon our Allies.

The interests of the further prose-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cution of the war dictated a number of purely military conditions which are subordinate to the chief and fundamental object of achieving the earliest possible victory over Hitler Germany. Roumania, which was formerly a strategical *place d'armes* for Germany in the Balkans, now becomes a *place d'armes* for military operations of the Allied forces, aiming at the complete elimination of Hitler's domination in the Balkans and the restoration of the independence and sovereignty of the Balkan peoples.

Roumania undertakes to put into the field not less than 12 infantry divisions for action against Germany and Hungary. The operations of Roumania's armed forces will come under the general direction of the Allied (Soviet) Command. All war and economic resources with which Roumania formerly nourished Germany will now be utilized against Germany and Hungary with a view to shortening the war.

For this purpose, an Allied Control Commission will be set up, functioning under the general direction of the Allied (Soviet) Command, which will exercise supervision over the observance of armistice terms.

In fighting Germany and Hungary, Roumania is fighting for the restoration of her independence and sovereignty. The armistice terms open the road to Roumania for the restoration of her sovereign rights. The Agreement is drawn up in the spirit of respect for the independence and national interests of the Roumanian State. From beginning to end its terms fully harmonize with the principles proclaimed by the Soviet Government on April 2 of this year, when the Red Army following in the pursuit of the enemy entered Roumanian territory. In its declaration at that time, the Soviet Government stated that it had no intention of acquiring any part of Roumania's territory or of changing the existing social order in Roumania, or in any way limiting her independence. Roumania will have to defend her territory and her independence, not against the Soviet Union, but against Germany and her Hungarian accomplices.

A piratical gang sold Roumania's national interests to Hitler. As an "ally" of Roumania, Hitler ravaged her by turning over part of her territory to Hungary. It is a noteworthy fact that the Allied powers are restoring to vanquished Roumania what was wrested from her by her former ally. The Allied powers, in deference to Roumania's national interests, have repudiated the so-called "Viennese arbitration," which gave Roumanian Transylvania to Hungary. Roumania has now come out to fight for the recovery of her Transylvanian lands. The Soviet Union is aiding and will aid her in this. The armistice terms are fair and generous. The significance of the Agreement is determined, not only by its Articles, but also by the influence it will exercise upon the future course of events. The Armistice Agreement testifies to the disintegration of Hitler's piratical bloc. Roumania has broken with Germany and turned her weapons against her.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Following upon Roumania, Finland and Bulgaria have also broken with Germany. Only Hungary still remains in the Hitler camp and is continuing the criminal war under Germany's command. The Agreement with Roumania substantially changes the situation in the Balkans and will facilitate the early liberation of the Balkan countries from the German yoke.

The armistice terms create conditions for the future establishment of normal relations between the Soviet Union and Roumania. Roumania is our neighbor and the Soviet Union wants to have good relations with its neighbors. The armistice terms reflect this general policy of the Soviet Union and its concern for the future peaceful intercourse among nations in the interests of general peace.

The Soviet people will greet the armistice agreement with Roumania with satisfaction . They will see in it a wise, far-sighted, dignified and just expression of their victory.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

WHY EHRENBURG WON THE ORDER OF LENIN

THE TEMPERING OF RUSSIA. By Ilya Ehrenburg. Alfred Knopf, New York, 1944. 356 pp.

WHEN Ilya Ehrenburg received the Order of Lenin, millions in the Soviet Union rejoiced. Konstantin Simonov, upon that occasion, referred to Ehrenburg's "inexhaustible heart." It is that heart which explains the deep affection in which he is held by the Soviet peoples: in the war's darkest days he spoke—in flaming words—their aspirations, their tenderest hopes, their fiercest prides, their national dignity. He, the humanist, saw that man's dignity is integral with the nation's: one cannot survive without the other. And his country was in mortal danger. On the longest battlefront in history his countrymen fought to retain their independence, and Ehrenburg proclaimed that in words that the Khirgiz shepherd, the Ural Stakhanovite, the Leningrad academician understood equally. "We must save Russia—and we will save her!" That was his credo, by which he would live or die. And when Von Bock pointed his field-glasses at Moscow's shining spires, eighteen miles off, Ehrenburg wrote: "In a valiant regiment there are no bad soldiers. You will be called to account before your wife, your conscience, your native land." We in America should understand him well: he had as much in common with the embattled Guardsmen at Mozhaisk as Tom Paine with the ragged Continentals at Valley Forge. Ehrenburg knows Russia's soul. He knew that she loved life and hated the enemies of man; he is the cartographer of Russia's heart. He knows the grandeur of her love, and the fury of her hate.

Time and again, he wrote when the fortunes of war seemed grimmest: "The Russian people have a big heart. They know well how to love. They also know how to hate. On this solemn and grave day we swear to love and to hate. We shall annihilate the Hitlerites. . . . Moscow is fighting for herself, for Russia, and for you, far-away brothers, for humanity, for the whole world." He wrote that in the first year of Russia's trial, when she stood countering the full fury of Nazi might bolstered by the arsenals of an entire continent.

And in those days his magnificent words echoed and re-echoed up and down the two-thousand mile battleline from the polar lands of Murmansk to the apple-groves of the Crimea. Those facing the bite of Nazi bullets understood him, loved him, sought him out. From Sevastopol: "Please write a couple of bitter words about the Fritzes who thought they could capture our city in three days." From the editor of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an underground newspaper in occupied territory: "We are using your article as an editorial." Soldiers before going over the top urged their commanders: "Read us his latest." And Simonov himself tells of one of the big partisan detachments that had a code of written instructions, one point of which said: "All newspapers after being read may be used for cigarette papers, except for those sections containing Ilya Ehrenburg's articles." I don't believe the latter story is apocryphal: one never burns a letter from home, one treasures it, goes into battle with it next to the heart. That is Ehrenburg. No wonder Simonov said: "When a comrade of the pen is decorated for his services to the country, it awakens in us a feeling of pride in our profession." In the profession as a whole, yes, but particularly for Ehrenburg. "For I am convinced," Simonov continues, "that that man has toiled harder, more self-sacrificingly, and better in these trying days than any of us. All honor and glory to him." In the time of peaceful construction Stalin once referred to writers as "engineers of the soul." In this time of war Ehrenburg could be considered as Guardsman of it.

The Tempering of Russia is testimony to Simonov's estimate. Written in the first thirteen months of the war, when the mighty armor of Hitler pushed on into the heart of Russia, when a horrified world saw the Nazis stand in Moscow's suburbs, Ehrenburg never lost faith, neither in his countrymen nor in democratic mankind. As to his countrymen: "Hitler had expected a civil war, a fifth column, the collapse of our young statehood, but never yet have we been so closely knit together. Sorrow, and hatred for the enemy—there is no stronger cement." As for Russia's allies: when the Nazis stood within gunshot of the Kremlin, on the eve of November 7, 1942, he wrote—"A placard hangs on the front of a house half-wrecked by a bomb: 'Long live the fighting union of the U.S.S.R. and Great Britain!' In a small town in the rear a huge banner flutters in the air over a former smithy, which now houses a Moscow airplane factory. It reads: 'Long live the United States of America!' These decorations are put up for tomorrow's celebration. I want to tell my friends in England and America: Look closely into the night, listen to the sound of battle. We did not evade the fight. We know: great peoples are destined to live through great trials. Greeting our friends in England and the United States on the eve of our holiday, we say from the bottom of our hearts: at the table friends clink glasses. In war friends fight together." On June 6, of this year, the world understood Ehrenburg's prescience. Today Britain fully understands why, two years ago, Ehrenburg said, "Wells wrote recently: 'We don't help you enough.' I should like to answer: 'No, you don't help yourselves enough.'" Today, as this is being written, on D-Day Plus 100, I read the headlines: "Allied Troops Fighting Six Miles Within Ger-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many; Red Army Troops Cross East Prussia Line." The testimony is complete.

Ilya Ehrenburg understands Russia: this humanist understands man. When the Nazi horde descended upon Ehrenburg's homeland, armed with the weapons of all Europe's arsenals, he knew that man's spirit can conquer the machine. When the armadas of Nazi tanks rolled on as far as Stalingrad, he—the Jew from Kiev—could say: "Russian courage will stop them. Russian daring will drive them back." His faith in his homeland was not blind: he knew why he trusted. He understood the history of Russia since 1917, knew it through the centuries. He knew that the Poles had tried to destroy Russian independence at the opening of the seventeenth century. They failed. The Swedes tried it at the beginning of the eighteenth. They failed. Napoleon tried it at the beginning of the nineteenth, and he returned to Paris, his power irrevocably broken. In the twentieth century Ehrenburg, the student of 1812, student of France, understood Eugene Tarlé, the historian, who wrote in *Napoleon's Invasion of Russia:* "Napoleon's threat was the most formidable, for since the days of Alexander of Macedonia and Julius Caesar, the world had not seen such monstrous power concentrated in one hand. He dominated an immense empire, inhabited by the most diverse, wealthy, civilized nations. His power over them was unbounded, his military genius was and still is regarded as unsurpassed in the history of mankind. The Russian people smashed this giant."

Conversant with his homeland's tradition, he knew that if it could smash Napoleon, "the giant," it could smash Hitler, the Napoleon on stilts. If the Russian people fought so valiantly to retain their sovereignty under Czar Alexander, they would fight many times more bravely under Soviet power, when they, the people, were the masters of the land. Ehrenburg knew this, hence his infinite confidence. Russia's tradition had become the property of the entire Soviet people: they had not repudiated it.

The defeat of Napoleon gave birth to the resurgence of Russian culture; its greatest expression was the immortal Pushkin whose poetry reflects, in the words of Tarlé, "the proud, joyful awareness of his people's moral power." That moral power, the historian says, overthrew "the idol oppressing the kingdoms." The war against Hitler has heightened contemporary Soviet culture, which expresses itself best in an Ilya Ehrenburg who can write:

"What happened at Moscow, however, is not a casual episode, but a very instructive story. The force of human spirit, the light of reason, the sense of dignity, have conquered the darkness of barbarism, the soulless mechanism of the 'robots,' the bombast of parasites." The eternal humanist, this Soviet writer continues: "We have carried light through the darkness of this autumn, the light of our culture and that which we justly call all-human culture. It is the light of ancient

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Greece, the light of the Rennaisance, the light of the Eighteenth Century Enlightenment — everything that man has set forth against submission, inertia, atavism. The bright, sunny principles that are at the base of our fight against Germany—reason, mental cleanliness, freedom, dignity." And, in the same passage, he has the foresight to say, in 1942, *before* Stalingrad: " 'Do you know what is justice?' I asked a German prisoner. Instead of an answer he covered his face with his hand, as if I had aimed a blow at him. Such I see Germany now—afraid to glance ahead."

For Ehrenburg knew his Germans. If he could chart the heights of the Russian soul, he knew the depraved depths of the Nazi's. He had seen the Nazi in Paris, in 1940, understood how Hitler, like Circe of old, had turned men into swine. "They say themselves that for them well-bred cows are superior to Heine's poems. They insulted the French philosopher Bergson before his death—to these savages he was only a *Jude*. . . . How can one speak of culture when they violate ten-year-old girls and bury them alive in the ground?" Ehrenburg knew the Nazi before we did: to him the Hitlerite is a monster shaped like a man. The soul is missing and the Nazi is only as strong as his tank, his Messerschmidt. But warriors must be stronger than their steel. He knew Hitler's Achilles' heel, his inevitable weakness. In the final analysis the soldier's strength lies in his soul, his morale. And it was in that that Ehrenburg put his faith. Kutuzov's men beat Napoleon's because the Russians fought a holy war—a war for homeland, hearth, family. Stalin's men beat Hitler's because the Russians fought for justice, for righteousness. Hitler had ground out all decency, all human dignity from his *Jugend*. Ehrenburg saw them in Paris, before June 22, 1941, and he sized them up in a paragraph: the unforgettable picture of a Nazi corporal, gobbling butter out of a barrel on a narrow Paris street—"without bread, hastily, lest others come to share this liquid butter, melted in the sun." While many were still blind to the truth, Ehrenburg described the Wehrmacht as "an army of ravishers"; German troopers were "automatons handling automatics." The Red Armyman face to face with the enemy knew the accuracy of Ehrenburg's appraisal. Hence, their regard, their esteem, for their tribune.

Concomitantly, Ehrenburg knew the Soviet man, knew the world democratic man. He instinctively grasped the motivations of a people that moved an entire industry from Kiev across the plains to the Urals, understood the miracle of "machines as refugees." He knew why his countrymen could withstand blizzards and burning sun, these weary-eyed, haggard men, women and children laboring on the defenses, turning out KV tanks, bombs, Stormoviks, working fourteen, sixteen hours a day. He knew the Red Army generals—Rokossovsky, Zhukov, Govorov, saw them in action, modest, close to their men, urging them on, living with them, joking with them, accepting their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hazards as their own. He knew the unbreakable ties which held the Soviet peoples together, the ties of a fraternity that grew out of the Soviet way of life. And he, the Jew, understood the Ukrainian, the Mongol, the Caucasian, the Cossack. "I am a Jew," he says. "I say this with pride. Hitler hates us most intensely, which is a feather in our cap." And he, the Jew, could describe the unforgettable scene in which the pious old rabbi was buried alive by the Germans near Korosten. "His head towered above the ground, and the wind played with his beard. He sang before he died, extolling life, and his last words were, 'Green grass lives longer than Nebuchadnezzar!' " And Ehrenburg knew that the Mongol, the Ukrainian, the Cossack could understand the song of the old rabbi.

Here, then, is the poet of the Great Patriotic War, as the Russians call it. He sings of 1944 as Pushkin sang of 1812. And his song is universal as the war is universal. "The war has become world-wide," he wrote in 1942. "Moscow's guns answer the shooting of the hostages of Nantes. The destiny of Washington has become closely dependent on some hitherto unknown small towns—Mozhaisk, Volokolamsk, Naro-Fominsk."

For these reasons it is hard for me to understand those reviewers of Ehrenburg's book who missed its grandeur, its epic significance, its universality. He did not strive for literary effect in his pieces, he tells us, but he achieved immortality with them. For they mirror the greatest endeavor of all mankind. It was, therefore, hard to keep anger down when I read the review by Gerald W. Johnson, in the *Herald Tribune*, August 15, who said: "The ordeal of one nation cannot be compressed into words and transferred, like a bank check, into the possession of another." (The million and a half corpses of Lublin —"like a bank check"!) Mr. Johnson feels that "the effect of the book can hardly be reassuring." He shrinks from Ehrenburg's "passion." Mr. Johnson believes that "Ehrenburg has seen only too much evidence of bestial and reptilian acts in the occupied parts of Russia...," and he decries Ehrenburg's "invective." He has the temerity to say: "His opinion of the Nazis tends somewhat to undermine faith in Russian judgment after the war." His conclusion: "It is no news that the Russians hate the Germans intensely. How could they help it?" They? *They*? And what about you, Mr. Johnson? Have you a good word for the crematorium operators of Lublin? Do you breathe easily because it was not your children they pushed into the furnace? I am wary of a man who can retain academic calm when ghouls are on the march. Who can abhor "passion" when ghouls have despoiled the homelands of Europe, have decimated peoples, have annihilated four million Jews, have made of the Continent one giant Lublin, have tortured, burned, raped. I am distrustful of a man who can speak with such "objectivity" when our

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own boys face Nazi shot and shell, when the women and children of London live under the dread of the robot bomb. It would be well for Mr. Johnson to read the testimony of his contemporary W. H. Lawrence, of the *New York Times*, who cabled, after Lublin, "I am now prepared to believe any story of German atrocities, no matter how savage, cruel, or depraved."

I do not know the nature of Mr. Johnson's politics, but I can, with justice, distrust it. His "objectivity" grows out of the miasma of Munich; the lessons of history have gone over his head. He could not understand Ehrenburg when the latter wrote, speaking of the Germans: "They say, 'We are against the Soviet order.' That is a lie. It makes no difference to them what kind of government we have. They want to rob us. France was a republic. The Germans were against a republic. Yugoslavia was a monarchy. The Germans were against a monarchy. Poland has a rightist government. . . . Norway a leftist government. The Germans were against the Right and against the Left."

I fear Mr. Johnson reflects the ideas of those nostalgic for Munich—the William Bullitts, the apostles of a "soft," a negotiated peace. Fortunately, the majority of Americans have come to different conclusions. It will be hard to prevail upon them to back-track. The crews of our shuttle-bombers returning from Russia tell stories which jibe with truth. The fliers would agree with Ehrenburg when he tells of the Soviet aviators assembling our lend-lease planes: "We worked with the Americans a whole month. It was sad to part. Mr. Zemke and Mr. Ellison proved to be wonderful comrades. They froze with us, worked with us without stopping. When they saw the way we worked, they became so absorbed in our task they would not stop to eat—they were with us all the time. They tried to help us in every way." The *Herald Tribune* critic may have trouble comprehending that spirit of comaraderie: the American people will understand it in a trice.

For Mr. Johnson is not, fortunately, typical even among the commentators in the press. Many of his contemporaries among our war correspondents, those who faced fire and lived with our troops, would tell a different story. For our correspondents have shown their mettle in the battle's heat, and their many dead is testimony to their patriotism. The rate of their casualty list is higher even than that of the army's. And if they have not equalled Ehrenburg as tribune, it is not of their own choice: they are hamstrung by editors like Roy Howard (not to speak of the McCormick - Hearst - Patterson Axis). Nonetheless our war correspondents, by and large, have won their spurs, particularly in their books; they would appreciate Ehrenburg, who is called, by Leland Stowe, this war's greatest reporter. This is what Mr. Stowe wrote in his August 20 review, in the *Herald Tribune:* "Ilya Ehrenburg's pen is a flaming torch, searing and unashamed." And Mr. Stowe, recognizing the Soviet patriot, recognizes simultaneously the lover of all hu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manity. It is implicit in the quotations he culled from Ehrenburg. These: "I shall not say the battle around Moscow was a miracle. No, the miracle was our nation, our people, the strength of our spirit. For a quarter of a century we have been preparing for this miracle. We have paid for it with suffering. . . . We have had faith in man, and man has saved Russia." And this: "We want peace not for five, ten, twenty years. We want our children to tell stories about tanks as if they were prehistoric monsters." And once again: "A true patriot loves the whole world. Having discovered the greatness of one's land, it is impossible to conceive hatred for the world." It seems to me these three quotations can, as much as few words can, summarize a man. This is Ehrenburg, and it is to Mr. Stowe's tribute that he cites them. Understanding them, he can close his review with these words: "In every sense Ehrenburg is the prophet of Russian victory. He has inspired and helped shape it, and he has done it with a moral voice. No more revealing book has been written about Russia at war."

Yes, our people will see Ehrenburg as a journalist who writes in Russian, but who talks a language all freedom-loving men can grasp. He believes in the dignity of man; in love of homeland; in love of children; in love of peace. Americans understand that. He speaks in hatred of Nazi barbarism. He says: To love, one must know how to hate. He who truly loves man can only hate the despoiler of man. To those truly at war this is as simple as gunfire. Our people will understand Ehrenburg when he says: "We want our children to forget the sound of sirens. We want our children to tell stories about tanks as if they were prehistoric monsters." For these reasons America will understand *The Tempering of Russia.* For it was the tempering, too, of mankind.

JOSEPH NORTH.

"FREEDOM ROAD"—A WEAPON OF DEMOCRACY

FREEDOM ROAD. By Howard Fast. Duell, Soan and Pearce, New York, 1944. 264 pp.

HOWARD Fast's *Freedom Road* should do much to destroy that elaborate network of myths about the Reconstruction period which our culture has so zealously preserved as an ideological justification for the continued oppression of the white and Negro masses of the South. It is a swift and moving novel which dramatizes the brief triumph and ultimate defeat of Southern democracy following the Civil War, and it teaches a basic lesson which our country needs sorely to learn during this crucial period of national decision. Moreover, as is characteristic of Fast's historical novels, *Freedom Road* is written with superb literary craftsmanship.

Here is the story of a Negro slave, Gideon Jackson, who escaped from

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the old Carwell plantation in South Carolina to join and fight with the Union Army, and who later returned to struggle for real freedom and security for his people. It is a story of how that struggle triumphed—through a new and rapidly growing unity between poor whites and Negroes, expressed no less in their cooperative efforts to obtain land and protect their homes and lives than in the unprecedented and vigorous people's democracies they built in the Southern states. It is also a story of how that struggle was defeated—through direct terror and violence, disruption of Negro-white unity by means of the organized "white supremacy" propaganda, and destruction of the new democratic state governments, all of which was made possible by the conscious collaboration of a newly elected Republican national government with the former slave-holders, who never ceased planning and fighting to restore their exploitative rule over the Southern masses.

* * *

Here is an accurate interpretation of a crucial period of our history about which all but exceedingly few Americans are either quite ignorant or grossly misinformed. A few historians—such as W. E. B. DuBois *(Black Reconstruction in America)* and James S. Allen *(Reconstruction: The Battle for Democracy)*—have writen honest and correct analyses of the issues and forces in conflict during the Reconstruction period. But their interpretations have largely been smothered under the never-ending avalanche of lies by which this bright and promising chapter of American democracy continues to be maligned. Demagogic politicians (such as Talmadge and Rankin and "Cotton Ed" Smith), school textbooks (even in the North), the commercial press, and the movies (such as the infamous and widely distributed "Birth of a Nation" and "Gone With the Wind")—all have conspired to perpetuate the myth that Reconstruction was an orgy of governmental extravagance and social chaos resulting from the political domination of ignorant Negroes and corrupt Northerners ("carpetbaggers"). In destroying Reconstruction—so the myth runs—the abused and "respectable" white leaders of the South (that is, the ruling oligarchy of plantation owners whose efforts to split the Union were defeated by the progressive forces around Lincoln) rendered a great service to the nation.

This monstrous lie has been aggressively propagated and entrenched in our culture, and the reason is by no means obscure; it was (and is) needed to bolster up and give some semblance of respectability to that flagrantly undemocratic economic and political system by which the masses are kept in subjection on the plantations of the Black Belt. Just why Americans have not been allowed to learn the truly progressive character and achievements of the Reconstruction period is effectively stated in "An Afterword" to *Freedom Road.* Says author Fast:

"Powerful forces did not hold it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be a good thing for the American people to know that once there had been such an experiment—and that the experiment had worked. That the Negro had been given the right to exist in this nation as a free man, a man who stood on equal ground with his neighbor, that he had been given the right to work out his own destiny in conjunction with the southern poor whites, and that in an eight-year period of working out that destiny he had created a fine, a just, and a truly democratic civilization."

Howard Fast tells this story of Reconstruction democracy with a fervor and power that none but a genuine people's artist could command. Around the lives and fortunes of Gideon Jackson's family and friends on the Carwell plantation, as well as his friendly associates and enemies in the state constitutional assembly and legislature and national Congress, there is here woven a gripping acount of an entire era in American history. It is with deep understanding and respect that the author sketches the crude first attempts of these simple freedmen and poor whites to organize their lives—and their government—in accord with the new demands of political democracy. The reader lives with these characters, suffering their embarrassments and frustrations, exulting in their triumphs, and getting genuine happiness out of their comradeship and love for one another. Here and there are passages of beautiful imagery and a lyric quality of the highest order.

Freedom Road begins on that day in 1867 when the Carwell men return from "the voting" in Charleston—down that mysterious path which to Gideon's son is a "road that leads to nowhere"—to set their wives and associates to wonder, and also to begin initially timid experimentation with this new technique of group living. The story moves swiftly, and with remarkable economy of words. Only with extreme difficulty and regret can a reader lay it aside before that final and tragic scene at the plantation house when the Carwell folk fight and die heroically against the superior armed forces of political reaction which had regained control of the South by 1877.

* * *

This novel is replete with urgent political lessons which are of the utmost importance for white and Negro Americans now confronted with the tasks of electing a President and Congress, and of actually achieving that enduring peace and security for all men which our coming victory in this people's war now raises as a new and realistic perspective before the world.

First, the original and basic ideological theses which "white supremacy" still claims as its "moral justification" is thoroughly demolished by this novel. For millions of Americans to read this story would mean further to undermine the tottering foundations of Bourbonism which is the implacable foe of the progressive Roosevelt policies and whose 1944 revival of the post-Reconstruction tie-up with reactionary Republicans presents one of the gravest home-front threats to American democracy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second, the carefully nurtured premise that an allegedly "eternal" anti-Negro prejudice will always prevent the white and Negro masses from unting for common political goals, an assumption being rapidly shattered by the events of this period, is here revealed (as true scientists have long known) to be grossly contrary to historic fact. For example, the main "poor white" character, Abner Lait, initially greets Gideon Jackson with the words, "God damn you, nigger," expressing all the anti-Negro hatred which two centuries of slavery and its white chauvinist propaganda had built up in the sorely oppressed poor whites of the South. But in the concrete struggles for land and schools and life, Abner Lait, like many, many thousands of white Southerners similarly situated, learns that his own freedom and security are absolutely dependent upon unity with his black fellowmen. He comes to respect them, to accept Gideon Jackson's leadership, to send his children to the "mixed" school; and he finally dies in a vain effort to carry to the outside world some word of the tragic plight which K.K.K. terror finally brought to the heroic little band of white and Negro citizens who fought to the end against an emerging and dominant reaction.

The metamorphosis which Reconstruction brought about in the attitude of the Abner Laits sets forth one of the truly great lessons of this period; namely, the speed with which artificially bolstered racial prejudices dissolve among the masses of men when they are confronted with a concrete social situation which allows (or impels) their uniting for security and survival.

Third, this novel correctly attributes the violent destruction of Reconstruction democracy to the deliberate calculations of "respectable gentlemen" who, themselves, never participate *openly* in the terroristic activities which their money and influence actually call into being. There are many Stephen Holmses in our national life today, powerful men who have vested interests in the perpetuation of jim-crow economic exploitation and oligarchic political rule. Their influence must be destroyed; and it can be accomplished only through the method used in the Reconstruction South—through fighting unity between the white and Negro masses who are their common victims.

These are but illustrative of many basic political insights which await the reader of *Freedom Road*. And it is important to emphasize their historic accuracy. Howard Fast, himself, presents a list of his original sources, which competent students of history immediately recognize as reliable and valid. In a recent conversation with a friend, I ran into further confirmation of the novel's accuracy from an unexpected source. My friend is a direct descendent of a long line of "free Negroes," the educated and refined Cardoza family of Charleston, which the novel portrays as coming to respect and admire Gideon Jackson, to seek his political advice, and to depend upon his strong and almost instinctively correct leadership. She told me that all of How-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ard Fast's details about the Cardoza family of the 1870's are amazingly accurate, with one minor exception —the complexion of Mrs. Cardoza is somewhat lighter than the novel suggests.

This novel is written with a simplicity that warrants its circulation by the millions. Indeed, it should be filmed and shown to scores of millions. And nothing could be more appropriate than for the role of Gideon Jackson, the main character of Howard Fast, to be played by that other great people's artist of our age, Paul Robeson.

There was never a time in recent history when the popularization of the message of *Freedom Road* was so urgent as it is today; for now, much as was true some sixty-eight years ago, our country is again on the verge of another major decision which is crucial for the freedom of the nation and the Negro people.

We now hasten to the climax of another great war of liberation which has propelled the Negro people forward toward their historic goal of freedom and has laid solid foundations for the building of enduring peace and security for all mankind. The happy and unprecedented outlook which emerges from the advances toward speedy victory by the armies of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition is in our country primarily an expression of the national unity forces gathered around the Commander-in-Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Roosevelt's domestic and foreign policies must be continued if the progressive goals now almost within our grasp are actually to be attained.

Again, as during Reconstruction, those who would oppress the people plot to destroy the gains which the Roosevelt Administration and this liberating war have brought to Negro and all other Americans. Again they see their opportunity in an electoral conspiracy not unlike that which brought a reactionary Republican Party to power in 1876 through the election of Rutherford B. Hayes. Again under the demagogic banner of "states' rights" and through the covert stimulation of anti-Negroism, the Republican candidate for President and his Congressional supporters have entered into a sinister alliance with the poll-tax Democrats of the South for the purpose of reversing the current progressive trend of history.

"Freedom Road" is again in danger of being blocked for the Negro people and the nation!

As we approach the crucial day of decision, November 7, 1944, it is absolutely imperative that we build the closest possible unity between the democratic white and Negro people of America—and the mass reading of Howard Fast's great book would contribute mightily to that end. Widespread dissemination of the lesson of Negro-white unity, the novel's main thesis, is urgently essential to *guarantee* that we not send a modern Rutherford B. Hayes to the White House in this year of people's victories again to obstruct our progress along "Freedom Road."

DOXEY WILKERSON.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HISTORIC DOCUMENTS

Addresses to the International Security Conference at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D. C., by Secretary of State, Cordell Hull; British Under-Secretary of Foreign Affairs and leader of the British delegation, Sir Alexander Cadogan; Soviet Ambassador and leader of the Soviet delegation, Andrei A. Gromyko, on August 21, 1944.

SECRETARY HULL:

ON BEHALF of President Roosevelt and on my own behalf, I welcome you to Washington. In the name of both of us, I desire to offer some brief remarks on the opening of this important meeting.

The series of conversations which we initiate today marks another step toward establishing a lasting system of organized and peaceful relations among nations. We meet at a time when the war is moving toward an overwhelming triumph for the forces of freedom. It is our task here to help lay the foundations upon which, after victory, peace, freedom and a growing prosperity may be built for generations to come.

The very character of this war moves us to search for an enduring peace—a peace founded upon justice and fair dealing for individuals and for nations. We have witnessed — and are witnessing today — the sweep of forces of savagery and barbarism of the kind that civilized men hoped and believed would not rise again. Armed with the weapons of modern science and technology and with equally powerful weapons of coercion and deceit, these forces almost succeeded in enslaving mankind because the peace-loving nations were disunited. During the years while these aggressors made their preparations for attack, the peace-loving nations lacked both unity and strength because they lacked a vigilant realization of the perils which loomed before them. These forces of evil now face utter defeat because, at long last, their intended victims attained the unity and armed power which are now bringing victory to us.

The lessons of earlier disunity and weakness should be indelibly stamped upon the minds and hearts of this generation and of generations to come. So should the lessons of unity and its resultant strength achieved by the United Nations in this war.

Unity for common action toward common good and against common

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peril is the sole effective method by which, in time of peace, the nations which love peace can assure for themselves security and orderly progress, with freedom and justice. In the face of what modern war means to the physical and moral being of man, the maintenance of such unity is a matter of the highest and most enlightened self-interest. In the final analysis it is, first and foremost, a thing of the spirit.

Peace, like liberty, requires constant devotion and ceaseless vigilance. It requires willingness to take positive steps toward its preservation. It requires constant cooperation among the nations and determination to live together as good neighbors in a world of good neighbors. Peace requires an acceptance of the idea that its maintenance is a common interest so precious and so overwhelmingly important that all differences and controversies among nations can and must be resolved by resort to pacific means.

But peace also requires institutions through which the will to peace can be translated into action. The devising of such institutions is a challenge to the wisdom and ingenuity of men and women everywhere. That is why the United Nations, in the midst of a relentless prosecution of the war, have been working together to create the institutional foundations for a just and enduring peace.

These foundations must support arrangements for peaceful settlement of international disputes and for the joint use of force, if necessary, to prevent or suppress threats to the peace or breaches of the peace. They must also support arrangements for promoting, by cooperative effort, the development of conditions of stability and well-being necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations and essential to the maintenance of security and peace. These are basic problems of international organization.

Substantial progress has already been achieved through the Food and Agriculture Conference, the Conference on Relief and Rehabilitation, and the Financial and Monetary Conference. These and other similar steps are indicative of the profound desire of the United Nations to act together for advancing the well-being of their peoples. They have been achieved by the united effort of more than forty nations, large and small.

The Governments represented here are fully agreed in their conviction that the future maintenance of peace and security—the supreme objective of international cooperation—must be a joint task and a joint responsibility of all peace-loving nations, large and small. They solemnly proclaimed this conviction in a declaration of their Foreign Ministers at Moscow on Oct. 30, 1943. It cannot be emphasized too often that the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States, irrespective of size and strength, as partners in a system of order under law, must constitute the foundation of any future international organization for the maintenance of peace and security.

In the Moscow Declaration each

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government also assumed its share of responsibility for leadership in bringing about the creation of an international organization for this purpose through joint action by all peace-loving nations. Success or failure of such an organization will depend upon the degree to which the participating nations are willing to exercise self-restraint and assume the responsibilities of joint action in support of the basic purposes of the organization. There must be agreement among all whereby each can play its part to the best mutual advantage and bear responsibility commensurate with its capacity.

It is generally agreed that any peace and security organization would surely fail unless backed by force to be used ultimately in case of failure of all other means for the maintenance of peace. That force must be available promptly, in adequate measure, and with certainty. The nations of the world should maintain, according to their capacities, sufficient forces available for joint action when necessary to prevent breaches of the peace.

For a long time before the Moscow Conference, and especially during the months which have elapsed since that conference, each of our Governments has been making diligent preparations for an effort to reach the agreement to which I have just referred. We have committed our tentative thoughts to writing, and each of us has had an opportunity to study the results of the work done by the others. All this should make easier the task which is now before you of reaching a consensus of views which you can jointly recommend to your respective Governments.

It is the intention of the Government of the United States that after similar consultations with the Government of China, the conclusions reached will be communicated to the Governments of all the United Nations and of other peace-loving nations.

It is our further thought that as soon as practicable, these conclusions will be made available to the peoples of our countries and of all countries for public study and debate. We are fully aware that no institution—especially when it is of as great importance as the one now in our thoughts—will endure unless there is behind it considered and complete popular support. The will to peace must spring from the hearts and minds of men and women everywhere, if it is to achieve enduring peace.

For us in the United States, it is as natural as it is desirable that we gather around a table with the representatives of other nations to devise means for maintaing peace and security. No passion runs deeper in the thoughts of the people of this country than the belief that all men should enjoy liberty under law. It has been our faith from the beginning of our nation, it is our dream for the future, that every individual and every nation should attain freedom and the security to enjoy it. The people of this country are now united as never before in their determination that the tragedy which today is sweeping the earth shall not recur.

The people of all the United Na-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions are hoping and praying for the opportunity to build anew toward a system of decent and just relationships among nations. Their noblest capacities and their highest skills have been diverted from the creative pursuits of peace to the grim and terrible tasks of battle. They see the destruction of their homes and the resources of their lands. They will not be content with a precarious peace. Their sacrifices can only be rewarded by the fulfillment of their reasonable hopes.

It is the sacred duty of the Governments of all peace-loving nations to make sure that international machinery is fashioned through which the peoples can build the peace they so deeply desire. The President is confident, and I share his view, that this thought will govern the deliberations which you are now undertaking.

SIR ALEXANDER CADOGAN:

THE discussions which open today arise out of Article IV of the Declaration of Moscow, in the framing of which Mr. Hull played such a notable and prominent part. We have listened with admiration to the wise and powerful words with which he has initiated our labors, and we are, I know, all profoundly grateful to him for his indefatigable efforts in the cause of international understanding. Of him it may well be said that he embodies in his own thought and person the qualities which have been responsible for the reaction and the development of the country which he represents.

To the Soviet Government, too, we all have reason to be grateful. It was, I think, on M. Molotov's initiative that the decision to hold these discussions was taken; and it was evident from their attitude at the time of the Moscow conference that the Soviet Government attached the highest importance to the establishment of a system designed to prevent a recurrence of Nazi and Fascist aggression.

My Government, for their part, have from the outset favored such discussions as these and have done their best to facilitate them. We have expressed our provisional views in the papers which have been circulated, and are most happy to find that in the papers of all three Governments there is such a large measure of agreement.

There seems, in fact, to be a general will on the part of what are at present the three most powerful states in the world to achieve some kind of world organization, and, what is more, to achieve it soon. That should itself be a good augury for the success of our labors.

Chinese statesmen also have declared their wish to join in the establishment of such an organization, and I am confident that the subsequent discussions with the Chinese delegation will show that there is a community of aim on the part of the most populous and an-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cient of our civilizations.

We shall thus, I hope, be able to achieve agreement on principles between officials from States comprising about half the inhabitants of the globe, and from States, moreover, whose combined power and determination is now playing so prominent a part in overthrowing the sinister forces of evil which, only a few years ago, came near to dominating all mankind.

The victory of the United Nations, whenever it comes, must be complete, the military defeat of the aggressors must be made clear beyond all doubt, and most of all to the German people themselves, and those responsible for the wanton outrages that have horrified the civilized world must receive their just retribution. On that basis we may hope to build more securely for the future.

In 1919 there was a widespread feeling in many western countries that force was in itself an immoral thing; now there is a much more widespread conviction that it is only by the victors remaining both strong and united that peace can be preserved. We have, I believe, learned many salutary lessons during the last few years.

We are met here to plan a system which will enable individual nations to cooperate effectively for the common good. Individual nations, small and great, must be the basis of our new world organization; and our problem is to construct a machine which will give to each of them the responsibilities commensurate with its power. This is no light task, but it can be accomplished.

No one wishes to impose some Great Power dictatorship on the rest of the world; but it is obvious that unless the Great Powers are united in aim and ready to assume and fulfill loyally their obligations, no machine for maintaining peace, however perfectly constructed, will in practice work. On the other hand, even Hitler has surely learned by now, what we have ourselves long known, that it is not by riding roughshod over the smaller powers that the vital interests of the larger can in the long run best be protected.

Another lesson I submit we may learn from experience, is that we should not attempt too closely to define what is perhaps undefinable. As I have already said, no machine will work unless there is, at any rate on the part of the Great Powers, a will to work it; and equally even an imperfect machine may function satisfactorily provided such a will exists.

We might do well, therefore, to concentrate on certain guiding principles and on certain basic institutions, rather than on a set of detailed regulations, which, however ingeniously drafted, will probably have to be revised in the light of subsequent experience.

One other consideration I would put before you: we must remember that peace, in the negative sense of absence of war, is not enough. No world system can endure unless it permits of growth and unless it tends to promote the well-being of humanity as a whole. Hence, however we may fit the various non-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political world organizations into our general system, we must attempt to discover means whereby the expanding force of modern scientific discoveries is turned into constructive rather than into destructive channels.

For this reason we must arrange for at least a measure of coordination between the various functional organizations now created or to be created, and in some way gear them to our world international machine.

All I would emphasize here is that we should always recognize that if there is acute political instability, no economic or social organizations will function successfully, and on the other hand let us never forget that acute discomfort in the economic and social field will constantly hamper the smooth operation of the best political plans. In other words, freedom from fear and freedom from want, so far as human agency can contrive it, move forward simultaneously.

In conclusion, I must for my part emphasize that the working party from the United Kingdom is recruited from the humble official level. From that it follows that, so far as we are concerned, these talks are necessarily exploratory and noncommittal. Within these limitations we will make the best contribution we can, and I can pledge every one of us to devote his best energies and such knowledge and experience as he possesses to the search for agreed recommendations for submission by our Governments, if they approve them, to all the other United Nations. We may take comfort in the fact that, as will be seen from the memoranda already circulated, there is already much common ground.

Let us also not forget the time factor. Events are moving fast and peace may come sooner than some expect. It would be folly to delay the construction of at least some framework of future international cooperation until the problems of peace confront us with all their insistency. Moreover, the time even of officials is limited. If therefore we are to establish the points on which there seems to be provisional agreement, we must work fast and well.

Much depends on our efforts, and some give and take will probably be required. Let us go forward with a full sense of our responsibilities, not only to our own nations but to the world at large. Let us go forward, above all, with the determination to produce a scheme worthy of the men and women of the United Nations who are giving their all to make possible the construction of a better world.

AMBASSADOR GROMYKO:

THE present meeting is the first meeting of exploratory discussions between representatives of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union on the establishment of an international security

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organization. I fully share the thoughts expressed by Secretary Hull in regard to the importance of the present discussions.

The peoples of our countries are waging a life-and-death struggle against the worst enemy of humanity—Hitlerite Germany. This struggle has already cost our countries, as well as many other freedom-loving countries of the world, heavy human and material sacrifices. Waging a struggle for their freedom and independence, the peoples of our three great nations are also saving the freedom and independence of other freedom-loving peoples of the world.

As a result of the combined efforts of the Allies, our common foe —Nazi Germany—is nearing its inevitable catastrophe. Our brave warriors are squeezing the enemy from the east, west and south. As a result of the latest offensive of the Red Army, military operations are already being carried to enemy soil. The time is not far off when the combined efforts of the freedom-loving countries of the world, and, first of all, the efforts of our nations, will bring a complete and decisive victory and will force Nazi Germany to her knees.

In view of the heavy destruction and countless sacrifices which the present war has brought to humanity, the freedom-loving peoples of the world are naturally looking for means to prevent repetition of a similar tragedy in the future. They have shed too much blood and made too many sacrifices to be indifferent to their future. That is why they are striving to establish an international organization which would be capable of preventing a repetition of a similar tragedy, and of guaranteeing for the peoples peace, security and prosperity in the future.

Members of such an organization can be, as it is said in the four nations' declaration signed at the Moscow Conference on October 3, 1943, all big and small freedom-loving countries of the world. All of us are glad that one of the distinguished participants of the Moscow Conference, Secretary Hull, is among us at the present meeting.

It goes without saying that in order to maintain peace and security it is not enough to have the mere desire to harness the aggressor and the desire to apply force against him if it should be demanded by circumstances. In order to guarantee peace and security it is absolutely necessary to have resources with the aid of which aggression could be prevented or suppressed and international order maintained.

In the light of the above, it becomes clear what responsibility falls to the nations, members of the future security organization, and especially to the nations which bear the main brunt of the present war, and which possess the necessary resources and power to maintain peace and security.

That is why all those to whom freedom and independence are dear cannot but draw the conclusion that this freedom and independence can be preserved only if the future international security organization will in the interests of the freedom-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loving peoples of the world use effectively all resources in possession of members of the organization and, first of all, the resources of such great nations as the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain.

The unity displayed by these countries in the present struggle against Hitlerite Germany and its vassals gives ground for certainty that after final victory is achieved these nations will cooperate in maintaining peace and security in the future as they are cooperating at the present time in saving humanity from enslavement by the fascist barbarians.

In this noble striving our countries naturally cannot but find support on the part of the other United Nations, big and small, which will be participants of the international security organization, which will be based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all freedom-loving countries and which will bear joint responsibility for the maintenance of peace.

The unity of the Allies displayed in the struggle against the common foe and their striving to maintain peace in the future is a guarantee that the present exploratory discussions will bring positive results. They are the first step leading to the erection of a building in the foundation of which all freedom-loving peoples of the world are interested—for an effective international organization and maintenance of peace and security.

In closing, I consider it necessary to note the initiative taken by the Government of the United States in calling the present conference. The Soviet delegation is glad to begin discussions with the American delegation headed by Edward R. Stettinius, with whom I have had the pleasure since 1941 of meeting and discussing at different times various matters of mutual interest, and also with the British delegation headed by Sir Alexander Cadogan.

I have no doubt that in the course of the present discussions the representatives of the three nations will conduct their work in a spirit of mutual understanding and in a friendly atmosphere which cannot but add to the successful outcome of the discussions.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Books on American History

THE STRUGGLE FOR AMERICAN FREEDOM:
THE FIRST TWO HUNDRED YEARS

By Herbert M. Morais

Beginning with the English background of American history, this new study traces the settlement and development of the thirteen colonies, the growth of agriculture, commerce and industry, the rise of democratic institutions, the impact of mercantilism, the organization of colonial resistance and the successful fight for independence, ending with the triumph of the democratic forces under Jefferson.

Price $2.25

THE RISE OF THE AMERICAN NATION 1793-1824

By Francis Franklin

Interpreting the main events in the national development of the United States during its early history, this book covers the period from the establishment of the Federal Government in 1789 to the end of Monroe's second administration in 1825. It describes the democratic victory over Federalist reaction led by Jefferson and the national victory over foreign aggression in the War of 1812, concluding with an evaluation of the emergence in 1824 of new party formations reflecting the new economic groupings.

Price $2.00

"BUILDERS OF THE NATION" LIBRARY

Edited by Dr. Philip Foner

Abraham Lincoln: Selections From His Writings
Thomas Jefferson: Selections From His Writings
George Washington: Selections From His Writings

Cloth $.85, Paper $.25

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Book That Will Be Read 100 Years From Now—

THE PATH TO PEACE, PROGRESS AND PROSPERITY

Proceedings of the Founding Convention of the Communist Political Association

"A hundred years from now, men and women and boys and girls will still read it in libraries in every city of the world, because it gives an essential part of the history of our time. But it is not published for future historians. It is put into your hands as an instrument of war. . . .

"In this book you have the most advanced thought of the world-wide labor movement—the supposedly "mysterious" Marxist science —in the form of clear, simple political and economic sense expounded in plain American language from which the trace of Browder's native Kansas prairie is never missing."

ROBERT MINOR, from Introduction to
The Path to Peace, Progress and Prosperity

144 pages, Price $1.00

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED